



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

40.

834.

A
PRIZE DISSERTATION
ON
THE DOCTRINE OF FAITH
IN
THE HOLY TRINITY,

READ IN THE
DIVINITY SCHOOL, OXFORD, JUNE the 4th, 1840.

BY THE
REV. CHARLES BROOKSBANK, M.A.
Of Christ Church, Oxford, and late Curate of Haresfield, Gloucestershire.

“Keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science, falsely so called; which some professing, have erred concerning the Faith.”—1 Tim. vi. 20, 21.

LONDON:
T. G. F. & J. RIVINGTON,
ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD AND WATERLOO PLACE.

M DCCC XL.

834.

LONDON:
Printed by WILLIAM CLOWES and Sons,

THE late Mrs. ELIZABETH DENNIS DENYER, by her last will, bequeathed a sum of money to the Chancellor, Masters, and Scholars of the University of Oxford, in order to found Two Prizes of Thirty Pounds each, for the two best Discourses in English on certain Theological subjects.

By a decree of the High Court of Chancery, the dividends are paid in equal moieties to two members of the University, for two several Prize Dissertations in English, on two subjects to be selected yearly, and the Prizes in respect of such Dissertations to be adjudged by the Vice-Chancellor, the two Divinity Professors, and the two Proctors for the time being. The persons entitled to write for the Prizes to be in Deacon's Orders at least, and, on the last day appointed for the delivery of the compositions to the Registrar of the University, to have entered on the eighth, and not exceeded the tenth year from their matriculation.

1836. *On the Doctrine of Faith in the Holy Trinity.*—H. William Wilberforce, M.A., Oriel.

— *On the Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for the Salvation of Man.*—James Stephens, M.A., St. John's.

1837. *On the Divinity of our Blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.*—William Wellwood Stoddart, M.A., Fellow of St. John's.

— *On Original or Birth Sin, and the Necessity of New Birth unto Life.*—Henry Constantine Brooksbank, M.A., Wadham.

1838. *On the Divinity of the Holy Ghost.*—Robert Scott, M.A., Fellow of Balliol.

— *On the Influence of Practical Piety in promoting the Temporal and Eternal Happiness of Mankind.*—Thomas William Allies, M.A., Fellow of Wadham.

1839. *On the Justification of Man before God only by Christ, proving also that true Faith must be accompanied with good Works.*—John Wilson, M.A., Fellow of Corpus Christi.

— *On the Necessity of the Two Sacraments retained in the Church of England, and that they only are necessary to be retained.*—(Not adjudged.)

CONTENTS.

The Doctrine of the Trinity in Unity stated according to the Articles, Creeds, &c., of the Church of England, p. 9...and proved to be—

Scriptural.

The Jews before the birth of Christ not wholly ignorant of the Doctrine of the Trinity, p. 10...their imperfect knowledge no proof that the Doctrine of the Trinity is not fully taught in the Old Testament, p. 11...the Doctrine of the Trinity written in both Testaments, p. 12...and in an analogous manner, p. 12.—Both Testaments represent the Creator, p. 13...Redeemer, p. 15...and Guide of Israel as a Trinity in Unity, p. 16.

Personality of the Word.—The Word a Person, distinct from the Person of the Father, p. 22.—Divinity of the Word.—The Word proved to be the Angel of the Lord, p. 20...Jehovah, p. 22...Jehovah upon Mount Sinai, p. 23...the God of Abram, p. 24...plain proofs of the divinity of the Word, p. 25...other proofs drawn from a comparison of the Old and New Testaments, p. 25...titles applied to the Word, p. 26.

Personality of the Spirit.—Signification of *παράκλητος*, p. 27...peculiar construction used with the word *πνεῦμα*, p. 28...contrast between the departure of Christ and the coming of the Spirit, p. 28...mental faculties of the Spirit, p. 29...The Spirit a person, p. 29, distinct from the Person of the Father and Son, p. 29...Divinity of the Spirit...divine attributes of the Spirit, p. 29...the Spirit the Counsellor of God, p. 30...Fountain of Holiness, Grace, &c. p. 30...executes His own will, p. 31...sin irremissible committed against Him, p. 31...his titles, p. 31.

Catholic.

The Doctrine of the Trinity set forth in the Articles, Creeds, &c. of the Church of England, taught by the Fathers in all ages.—The Antenicenes agree with the Postnicenes in determining that the three Persons are of one Substance, i.e., Consubstantial, p. 33...and that the Substance is not of a specific but indivisible nature, p. 35.—The Antenicenes also agree with the Postnicenes in maintaining two distinct doctrines with respect to the Holy Trinity, i.e., one as regards the consubstantial nature of the Persons, p. 36...a second as regards the economy of the Persons, p. 36...the use of the two doctrines, p. 42.

And necessary to be believed for Salvation.

Faith in the Holy Trinity required in all ages, p. 44...required *after* the Council of Nice by the Athanasian Creed, p. 44...required *before* the Council of Nice, from the following considerations:—

1st. Sentence of Excommunication was passed by the Antenicenes upon all who rejected the doctrine of a consubstantial Trinity, p. 48...Theodotus, Artemon, Beryllus of Bostra, and others, p. 46.

2nd. The Creeds of the Antenicene Church were known symbols of a consubstantial Trinity, p. 49...many of them asserted the consubstantial nature of the Trinity as strongly as the Nicene Form, p. 51...*e. g.*, Gregor. Thaumaturgus, p. 51...Origen, p. 52...Lucian Martyr, p. 52...baptismal Creed of Eusebius, p. 53...The Creed in the Apostolical Constitutions, p. 54.

3rd. Baptism was considered by the Antenicenes to be null and void without Faith in a Consubstantial Trinity, p. 59...Testimonies of Justin Martyr, p. 60...Tertullian, p. 61...Origen, p. 61...Hippolytus, p. 64...Cyprian, p. 62, 63.

Recapitulation, p. 66.—Conclusion, p. 67.

THE DOCTRINE OF FAITH IN THE HOLY TRINITY.

THE Doctrine of the Holy Trinity, as it is explained by the Postnicene Church, acknowledges that there are Three distinct Persons united in one common Essence.

The Persons are declared to be *Three*, because they are supposed to be numerically Three; each being different and distinct from each other by office, by relationship, and by a particular mode of subsistence.

The Substance which unites the Three Persons is declared to be *One*, not by reason of number,¹ as if

¹ It is in this sense that St. Basil speaks of the Unity of the Divine Substance: “Πρὸς δὲ τοὺς ἐπηρεάζοντας ἡμῖν τὸ τρίθεον, ἐκεῖνο λεγέσθω, ὅτι περ ἡμεῖς ἓνα Θεὸν, οὐ τῷ ἀριθμῷ, ἀλλὰ τῇ φύσει ὁμολογοῦμεν, πᾶν γὰρ ὃ ἐν ἀριθμῷ λέγεται, τούτο οὐχ ἐν ὄντως, οὐδὲ ἀπλοῦν τῇ φύσει ἐστίν. ὃ δὲ Θεὸς ἀπλοῦς καὶ ἀσύνθετος παρὰ πᾶσιν ὁμολογεῖται. οὐκ ἄρα εἷς ἀριθμῷ ἐστὶν ὁ Θεός· ὃ δὲ λέγω τοιοῦτον ἐστίν· ἐν ἀριθμῷ τὸν κόσμον εἶναι φαμέν, ἀλλ’ οὐχ ἓνα τῇ φύσει, ἀλλ’ οὐδ’ ἀπλοῦν τινὰ τοῦτον· τέμνομεν γὰρ αὐτὸν, εἰς τὰ ἐξ ὧν συνέστηκε στοιχεῖα, εἰς πῦρ καὶ ὕδωρ, καὶ αἶρα καὶ γῆν· πάλιν ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἷς ἀριθμῷ ὀνομάζεται· ἓνα γὰρ ἄνθρωπον

it were the aggregate of certain numerical parts, but *one* in the strictest sense possible, being always perfect and entire in itself, and incapable of any separation whatever.

The Church, in her formularies of Faith, has stated the Doctrine in the following words: “ *There is but one living and true God . . . and in unity of this Godhead there be Three Persons, of one substance, power, and eternity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.*”¹

It will be the object of this Dissertation, to prove that the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity, as it is thus taught in the Articles and Creeds of the Church of England is *Scriptural, Catholic, and Necessary* to be believed in order to salvation.

Whether the Jews, anterior to the birth of our Lord, had any definitive notions of the Triune God,

πολλάκις λέγομεν· ἀλλ’ οὐχ ἀπλῶς τις ὄντος ἐστίν, ἐκ σώματος, καὶ ψυχῆς συνεστώς· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἄγγελον, ἓνα ἀριθμῷ ἑροῦμεν, ἀλλ’ οὐχ ἓνα τῇ φύσει, οὐδὲ ἀπλοῦν· οὐσίαν γὰρ μεθ’ ἁγιασμοῦ τὴν τοῦ ἀγγέλου ὑπόστασιν ἐννοοῦμεν· εἰ τοίνυν πᾶν τὸ ἐν ἀριθμῷ ἐν τῇ φύσει οὐκ ἔστι, καὶ τὸ ἐν τῇ φύσει καὶ ἀπλοῦν, ἐν ἀριθμῷ οὐκ ἔστι, ἡμεῖς δὲ λέγομεν ἓνα τῇ φύσει Θεόν, πῶς ἐπείσάγουσιν ἡμῖν τὸν ἀριθμὸν, αὐτὸν πάντῃ ἡμῶν ἐξοριζόντων τῆς μακαρίας ἐκείνης καὶ νοητῆς φύσεως; ὁ γὰρ ἀριθμὸς ἔστι τοῦ πόσον· τὸ δὲ πόσον τῇ σωματικῇ φύσει συνέζευκται, ὁ γοῦν ἀριθμὸς τῆς σωματικῆς φύσεως· σωμάτων δὲ δημιουργὸν τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν εἶναι πεπιστεύκαμεν· διὸ καὶ πᾶς ἀριθμὸς ἐκεῖνα σημαίνει τὰ ἔνυλον καὶ περιγραφτὴν ἔχειν λαχόντα τὴν φύσιν· ἡ δὲ μονὰς καὶ ἓνας τῆς ἀπλῆς καὶ ἀπεριλήπτου οὐσίας ἐστὶ σημαντικὴ.”—Basil, tom. iii. Epist. viii. 2. fol. Paris, 1730.

¹ Art. 1.

is a question that has not been very clearly determined.¹ Most probably the subject was only seen by them as "through a glass darkly."

But though the ancient Jews may not have attained unto the knowledge of the Trinity, it does not follow that their volume was destitute of evidence.

It may, on the contrary, be found, through the medium of a subsequent revelation, to be replete with that doctrine. Many passages of the New Testament are in themselves dark and obscure; but through the medium of the Old Testament they suddenly become clear and perspicuous; and in like manner many things which were doubtlessly hidden from the Jew, we, by help of the New, readily perceive. We need not therefore be surprised, if the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, like other doctrines, was not clearly perceived by the Jew, who had not the assistance of the New Testament.

¹ I have here stated my impression, after a diligent perusal of "Dr. Allix's Judgment of the Jewish Church." The extreme caution that is necessary in admitting the paraphrases and targums of the ancient Rabbins, and the conclusive evidence that may be furnished that Philo wrote *after* the birth of Christ, renders, in my opinion, any greater concession than is here made hazardous and questionable. In "Bryant's Sentiments of Philo concerning the Logos," published at Cambridge, 1797, the reader will find, from p. 30 to p. 221, a perfect refutation of the arguments which Dr. Allix, Mangey, and Basnage, have advanced in support of the antiquity of Philo's writings, as well as some very clear proofs that Philo had seen some of the writings of the Evangelists, and was well acquainted with the doctrines of Christianity.

On comparing the writings of the Old Testament with those of the New, it may now be seen that the doctrine of the Trinity was written in very legible characters on the page of Moses.

It appears that the dealings of God in the Old Testament were as unquestionably set forth by Moses to be the dealings of the Triune God, as those in the New are described to be so by the Evangelists. And it will be no inconsiderable argument in proof of the eternal and determinate counsel of God to reveal to mankind the mystery of the Trinity in Unity, if I shew, by comparing the two Covenants together, that as nearly as the two dispensations resemble each other, *i. e.*, as the Old Testament is the exact type of the New, so nearly does the relation which Moses has given of the Trinity in Unity coincide with that which has been given by the Evangelists.¹

In both Testaments the First Article of Faith is represented to be belief in the *Unity of the Divine Essence*. "The first of all commandments," says our Saviour, quoting the words of Moses, is, "Hear, O Israel, The Lord our God is one Lord."²

¹ Daniel Zuicker, a Prussian Socinian, asserted that the Platonic school was the founder of the Doctrine of the Trinity. It is my object to shew, by a comparison of the Old and New Testaments, that the doctrine claims a more ancient founder than Plato, and that Plato rather borrowed from Moses than the early Trinitarians from Plato.

² Mark xii. 29 ; Deut. vi. 4.

In both Testaments, where the Deity is described as *Creating* the world, *Redeeming* his people, or *Conducting* them into a land of rest, either in a literal sense or in a spiritual sense, we are taught to discern in either instance the dealings, not of an Unipersonal, but a Triune God.

The Creator of the Universe is called by Moses "Elohim," "Gods,"¹ by Solomon "Creators,"² by Isaiah "Makers:"³ in either of which instances

¹ Gen. i. 1.

² Eccles. xii. 1.

³ Isai. liv. 5. There is no figure of speech, nor grammatical construction, by which it is possible to convey the idea of a *Plurality* of Persons in the Godhead, that has not been employed by the writers of the Old Testament.

First. Moses commences the history of the Creation by saying, "In the beginning (Bara Elohim) the *Gods* created." Gen. i. 1. He might have said (as Dr. Allix has well observed in his "Judgment of the Jewish Church," p. 94) "*Jehovah Bara*;" Jehovah being the proper name by which God made himself known to Moses, and by him to His people. Exod. iii. 15. Or he might have said "*Eloah Bara*," and so he had joined the singular number of "Elohim," which signifies God, with the verb "Bara," which is also the singular number, and signifies "Created." But Moses uses the plural word, Elohim, with a verb of the singular number, and he repeats it thirty times in the history of the Creation only, though this word denotes a plurality in the Divine nature, and not one single person.

Secondly. God is represented, in the History of the Creation, as speaking to some one thus—"Let such a thing be made;" and then it follows, "it was made." And again,—"God said," and "God said." These expressions are very remarkable, when we consider that there were neither angels nor men at that time to

there is a direct intimation of a plurality of persons united in the substance of the Creator.

In the following passages we are distinctly told that the Creator is Jehovah, the Word, and the Spirit.

In Isaiah "Jehovah" speaks in the following exclusive words:—"I am the Lord that spreadeth abroad the earth by *myself*."¹ But notwithstanding these exclusive words "*by myself*," David says of *Christ*, "O my God, of old hast thou laid the foundations of the earth."² Job also, "The *Spirit* of

obey or hear God's voice; and they are repeated no less than eight times in one chapter.

Thirdly. God is represented as communing and sitting in council with others. "Let *us* make man in *our* image and after *our* likeness." Gen. i. 26. "Adam is become as *one of us*." Gen. iii. 22. "Let *us* go down and confound their language." Gen. xi. 7.

Fourthly. The following grammatical constructions are used.

1. A plural noun joined with a verb singular. "In the beginning the *Gods* created the heaven and the earth." Gen. i. 1. "If *I am Masters* where is my fear?" Mal. i. 6.

2. A plural noun joined with a verb plural. "And Jacob called the name of the place Bethel, because *the Gods* there appeared to him when he fled from the face of," &c. Gen. xxxv. 7.

3. A plural noun joined with an adjective plural. "You cannot serve the Lord, for He is the *Holy Gods*." Josh. xxiv. 19. Many other instances of similar grammatical constructions may be found in Allix's Judgment of the Jewish Church, p. 95, 96; and in Jones's Theological and Miscellaneous Works, vol. i. p. 56—65.

¹ Isai. xlv. 24.

² Psal. cii. 24, 25. That David addresses the second Person of the Trinity is evident, from Heb. i. 8.

God hath made me.”¹ “By His *Spirit* He hath garnished the heavens.”² God, therefore, who created the world by *Himself*, is, according to Moses, Jehovah, the Word, and the Spirit.

In the New Testament, where the new creation, of which the old was evidently the type, is set forth, the Evangelists tell us, that “*God*, for his great love wherewith He loved us . . . hath *quickened* us.”³ But they also tell us, that as the *Father* raiseth the dead and *quickeneth* them, even so *the Son quickeneth* whom he will.”⁴ And again, “*it is the Spirit that quickeneth.*”⁵ *God*, therefore, who quickeneth the heart of man; or, the Creator of the new universe, is, according to the Evangelists, *the Father, the Word, and the Spirit*.

We find the *Redeemer* also of mankind described in both Testaments in the same terms as the Creator of mankind. He is represented both by Moses and the Evangelists as one of Three Persons who are each very God.

Isaiah’s words are express on this matter. He introduces the Redeemer, saying:—“Thus saith the Lord thy Redeemer, the Holy one of Israel, I am the Lord thy God.”⁶ But notwithstanding this declaration of the Redeemer’s Godhead, the Redeemer adds in the very same breath, “And now the *Lord God*

¹ Job xxxiii. 4.

² Job xxvi. 13.

³ Eph. ii. 4.

⁴ John v. 21.

⁵ John vi. 63.

⁶ Isai. xlviii. 17.

and His Spirit hath sent Me;"¹ clearly shewing that there are two other Persons who are of the same substance, very God with Himself.

The relation of the Redeemer in the New Testament is precisely the same. The Redeemer attests his own Divine Essence by declaring, "I and my Father *are One*."² He speaks also emphatically of Three Persons; for He declares that the *Father* had sent Him;³ and that the *Spirit* had anointed Him for His office.⁴

The account which is given of the Being who *Protected and Guided* Israel into Canaan, conveys also the same intimation of a Triune God. When the redemption of Israel had been accomplished,

¹ Isai. xlviii. 16. Origen gives a different reading of this verse, and makes the following remark:—"τίς ἐστὶν ὁ ἐν τῷ Ἡσαΐα λέγων; καὶ νῦν κύριος ἀπέστειλε μὲ καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ. ἐν ᾧ ἀμφιβόλου ὄντος τοῦ ῥητοῦ πότερον ὁ Πατήρ καὶ τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα ἀπέστειλαν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἢ ὁ Πατήρ ἀπέστειλε τὸν τε Χριστὸν καὶ τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα. τὸ δεύτερον ἐστὶν ἀληθές."—Origen Contr. Cels. lib. i. The observation is very just, for we nowhere read in the Scriptures that Christ was sent by the Spirit, but everywhere that both Christ and the Spirit were sent by the Father, called in the text "*Lord God*." But the argument which springs from this passage in proof of the Trinity remains the same whichever way we read it. And as I have adopted the reading of our authorized version, I have given a sense in which the Spirit may, with strict propriety, be said to have sent Christ, *i. e.*, by descending upon Him, and anointing Him for the work of His ministry.

² John x. 30.

³ John vii. 28, 29.

⁴ John i. 33; Luke iv. 18. 21.

The Lord of Hosts made a covenant with his people, saying, "I will dwell among the children of Israel and will be their God. And they shall know that I am the Lord their God, that brought them forth out of the land of Egypt, that I may dwell among them. I am the Lord their God."¹ Now, in Haggai, *The Lord of Hosts* appeals to the words of this covenant and says, "According to the words that I covenanted with you when ye came out of Egypt, so my *Spirit* remaineth among you."² But the words of the covenant are not that the *Spirit*, but that *The Lord of Hosts* would dwell among Israel. The Lord of Hosts, therefore, by declaring that He had fulfilled the words of His covenant, and that He had fulfilled it by causing His Spirit to dwell with Israel, has identified the presence of the Spirit with His own presence, which is a direct assertion that He and the Spirit are of one essence. Isaiah³ carries the information a step further, and declares that the presence of the *Spirit* is the presence of the *Saviour* as well as of the *Lord of Hosts*.

In the New Testament the Spirit is represented as having been sent to fulfil the same office as it was in the days of Moses, *i. e.*, to "teach mankind, and to reprove the world of sin, righteousness, and judgment."⁴

The *Godhead* of the Spirit is also described in a

¹ Ex. xxix. 45, 46.

² Hag. ii. 5. Vide App. p. 71, note (a).

³ Isai. lxiii. 8, 10.

⁴ John xvi. 8.

similar manner; for in whomsoever the *Spirit* dwells, that body is declared to be the temple of *God*,¹ and also of the *Saviour Christ*.

Thus we see that the mysterious doctrine of the Trinity in Unity holds a very conspicuous place in both Testaments. It has been shadowed out, first by Moses, and afterwards by the Evangelists, in the three works of the *Creation*, *Redemption*, and the *Entrance of Israel into Canaan*. And in each Testament, when God is described as the *Creator*, or the *Redeemer*, or the *Guide* of His people, He is in each instance described, not as an Unipersonal God, but as a Triune God. He is represented either as one God, in the unity of which Godhead there are three Persons of one substance, power, and eternity; the Father, the Word, and the Spirit: or else, which is the same thing, three persons are set forth, each of which are pronounced to be very God, and our adoration restricted to one God.

I have now sufficiently pointed out the striking analogy which exists between the revelation which Moses has made of the doctrine of the Trinity, and that which has been made by the Evangelists; and it only remains for me to shew the powerful manner, in which the doctrine which I have endeavoured to deduce from the two Testaments, is attested by other passages of Scripture.

By three² Evangelists we are assured, that when

¹ 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17; Rom. viii. 9.

² Matt. iii. 16, 17; Mark i. 10, 11; Luke iii. 21, 22.

our Saviour was standing upon the brink of the river Jordan, “The heavens opened, *the Spirit* was seen descending and lighting upon *the Son of God* in a bodily shape like a dove; and a voice (which was neither that of Christ nor of the Spirit) was heard proceeding out of Heaven, saying, thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased.”

When Christ was about to depart from the world He gave commandment to His disciples to “go teach all nations, baptising them in the name of *the Father*, and of *the Son*, and of *the Holy Ghost*.”¹

And when the Apostle of the Gentiles gives his parting benediction to the Church, it is in these words, “The grace of the *Lord Jesus Christ*, and the love of *God*, and the communion of *the Holy Ghost* be with you all.”²

¹ Matt. xxviii. 19. Vide Appendix, p. 72, note (β).

² 2 Cor. xiii. 14. The order in which the Sacred Three are placed by the writers of the New Testament is by no means unworthy of attention.

In Matt. xviii. 19, the order is Father—Son—Holy Ghost.

In the present instance it is Son—Father—Holy Ghost.

In 2 Thess. iii. 5, it is Holy Ghost—Father—Son.

A clear proof that the Apostles and Evangelists considered “the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost to be all one; the Glory equal, the Majesty co-eternal.”

I have not brought forward the celebrated passage in St. John’s Epistle—“*There are three that bear record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one,*” 1 John v. 7—because many learned men have differed in opinion respecting its genuineness. Vide “A Selection of Tracts and

It was the pride of Sabellius to deny the doctrine of the Trinity by asserting that the Word and Spirit are not real persons, distinct from the Father, but energies only of God. Arius, running into the opposite extreme, admitted them to be two real and distinct persons, but denied the doctrine by asserting that they are not of one substance with the Father. A slight examination of Scripture will show the necessity of maintaining, in opposition to both these assertions, that the Word and the Spirit *are* real and distinct persons from the Father, and *are* of one substance with the Father.

There are many passages in the Old Testament which speak of a Being emphatically called "*The Angel¹ of the Lord*;" who, in his appearances and promises to the patriarchs, made frequent display

Observations on 1 John v. 7." in two parts, collected and published in London, 1824.—Horne's Introd. Holy Script. vol. iv. p. 448—470.

¹ "The phrase '*Angel of the Lord*,'" says Horsley, "which occurs in the English Bible, is a phrase of an unfortunate structure, and so ill conformed to the original, that it is to be feared it has led many into the error of conceiving of '*the Lord*' as one person, and of '*the Angel*' as another. The word of the Hebrew, ill rendered '*the Lord*,' is not, like the English, an appellative, expressing rank or condition, but it is the proper name, '*Jehovah*.' And this proper name, '*Jehovah*,' is not in the Hebrew a genitive after the noun-substantive, '*Angel*,' as the English represent it; but the words יהוה and מלאך, '*Jehovah*' and '*Angel*,' are two substantive nouns in apposition, both speaking of the same person, the one by the appropriate name of the *Essence*, the other by

of the divine attributes, omniscience,¹ omnipresence,² omnipotence;³ not only received, but demanded divine worship from the ancient worthies;⁴ professed⁵ himself to be God; and is pronounced, in the most unequivocal language, both by the persons to whom He appeared and the inspired penmen who have recorded those manifestations to be God.⁶

These circumstances render it conclusive that the Being who, though he appeared as angel, could not be a created being. It was, therefore, an *uncreated* being. But it could not be the Father, for He has never⁷ manifested Himself; and the answer which was made to Manoah furnishes positive evidence that it was the *Word*, "Why inquirest thou of my name," says the angel, "seeing it is *Secret*,"⁸ (margin)

a title of *office*. 'Jehovah-Angel' would be a better rendering. The 'Jehovah-Angel' of the Old Testament is no other than He who in the fulness of time was incarnate, by the Holy Ghost, of the Virgin Mary."—Biblical Crit. vol. iv. p. 314.

¹ Gen. xviii. 12. 15.

² Gen. xvi. 13.

³ Gen. xvi. 10; xvii. 19; xviii. 10; xxxv. 9. 11; compare Num. xxii. 35, with xxiii. 4, 5.

⁴ Ex. iii. 5; Josh. v. 14, 15; Judges xiii. 16.

⁵ Ex. iii. 2; Judges vi. 11, 12.

⁶ Gen. xvi. 13; xxxii. 24. 30. Jacob enquires of the Angel who wrestled with him, "What is thy name?" Gen. xxxii. 26. The question is answered by Hosea, xii. 3. 5, who says it was "The Lord of Hosts."

⁷ John i. 18; v. 37; vi. 46; Col. i. 15; 1 Tim. i. 17; vi. 16.

⁸ The name assumed by the angel is, in the Hebrew, מְבִרָא, which properly signifies "wonderful," "extraordinary," "marvellous."

“*Wonderful*,” which is the very title employed by Isaiah to distinguish the Word. Therefore, since the Word is that Being who manifested Himself as “*The Angel of the Lord*,” we come to the conclusion that the Word is a person distinct from the person of the Father, and yet of one substance with Him. The conversations which he held with the Patriarchs prove that He is a person, *i. e.*, a real intelligent Being. The open manifestations which He made of Himself that He is a person distinct from Him who has never manifested Himself. The divine attributes which he displayed, and the testimonies which were given to Him, that he is of a nature uncreate, and, therefore, of one substance with the Father.

The name, or rather the *descriptive* term, “*Jehovah*,”¹ which is borne by, and so frequently applied to, the Word, is another powerful proof of His divine nature. No created being can be *Jehovah*. It is a direct contradiction of terms. It is the same as to call a created being an uncreated being. “*Jehovah*” signifies “*The immutable necessary Self*—

The same word מְלָאךְ, is applied to the Messiah, Isai. ix. 5. The Greek interpreters seem to have been fully impressed with the idea that the *Messiah* was to be *the Angel of the Lord*. Their translation of Isai. ix. 5, runs thus:—“ὅτι παῖδιον ἐγεννήθη ἡμῖν, υἱὸς καὶ ἐδόθη ἡμῖν οὗ ἡ ἀρχὴ ἐγεννήθη ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄμου αὐτοῦ καὶ καλεῖται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Μεγάλης βουλῆς Ἄγγελος.”—Vide Allix Judg. Jewish Church, p. 88.

¹ Vide Appendix, p. 74, note (γ).

Existent ;” and to admit that a being is “Jehovah” is to admit that that being is “*The immutable necessary Self-Existent.*”

It may appear, perhaps, contrary to a pre-conceived opinion, that it is satisfactorily to be proved from Scripture itself, that the *Word* is the very Being who appeared with such awful majesty upon Mount Sinai.¹

In the 4th chapter of the Epistle to the Ephesians, St. Paul interprets the 68th Psalm, and

¹ The two facts which I have endeavoured to *prove from Scripture*, viz., “that the Word appeared on Mount Sinai,” and was “the God of Abram, Isaac, &c.” were facts admitted by all the earliest Fathers. In Bull’s *Defensio Fidei Nicænæ*, cap. i.,—Burton’s *Testimonies of the Antenicenes to the Divinity of Christ*, p. 38. 40,—and Waterland’s *First Defence*, p. 29. 32, the reader will find the currency of this opinion fully attested by copious extracts from Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, Novatian, and others.

Dr. Allix, in his “*Judgment of the Jewish Church*,” says that he will take upon himself to prove, in chapters xiii., xiv., xv. of his work, “*that all the appearances of God, or of the Angel of the Lord, which are spoken of in the Books of Moses, and in Moses’ time, and in the Books of the Old Testament after Moses’ time, have been referred to the Word of God by the Jews, before Christ’s incarnation.*”

I scruple, for the reasons assigned above, p. 11, note (1), to admit that all the Jewish writers which the Dean has quoted, lived *before* Christ’s incarnation ; but it is quite certain, from the testimonies which he has brought forward, that the opinion which was so common among the early Christian Church, was universally admitted by the early Jewish Church also.

tells us that David spoke of the *Word* when he said, "Thou hast led captivity captive." But by comparing the 17th and 18th verses of that Psalm together, it is clear that the same who "led captivity captive" appeared on Mount Sinai. Therefore, if it was the *Word* who "led captivity captive," it is obvious that it was the *Word* who appeared on Mount Sinai.

The 9th chapter of Nehemiah challenges a still further investigation, and discovers the *Word* to be that Being to whom the Israelites were wont to pray, and acknowledge as the Lord God of Israel—the Lord alone.

In the prayer which is mentioned in that chapter, after the Levites had enumerated the dealings of the God of Israel in choosing Abram, and bringing him from Ur of the Chaldees; in hearing the cry of his people in Egypt; dividing the red sea before them; and leading them by a cloudy pillar by day, and a pillar of fire by night; there are these words (verse 13),—"Thou camest down *also* on Mount Sinai." Now, it was before proved upon the testimony of Paul and David, that the *Word* appeared on Mount Sinai. It is plain, therefore, that the Word is the Being set forth in the early part of the prayer, who called Abram, took Israel for his portion, rescued them out the hands of the Egyptians, and was worshipped by them as the Lord God of Israel. In short, that *the Word is the Jehovah of the Old Testament.*

In the New Testament, little of that research is necessary which is required in the Old Testament to trace the divinity of the Word.

We are told in explicit terms, that Christ has “created *all* things;”¹ that He “upholdeth *all* things;”² and “by Him *all* things consist.”³ Neither of which expressions would be admissible if the Word Himself had been created, or was dependent upon a Superior Being. He is called “Immanuel,”⁴ or “*God with us* ;” “I am,”⁵ or “*The necessary Self-Existent*.”

Many expressions also are to be found, such as the following:—“In Him dwelleth *all the fulness of the Godhead* bodily;”⁶ “God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself;”⁷ “He that hath the Father hath the Son: He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.”⁸ Proofs such as these are too plain to require any comment.

Other proofs equally demonstrative of our Lord’s Divinity may be drawn by comparing passages of the Old Testament with passages of the New; by which it will be seen that the two Testaments would contradict each other upon the Arian hypothesis; that Christ is not of one substance with the Father.

In Isaiah, Jehovah declares, “I am the Lord, and there is none else: there is *no* God besides me.”⁹ But St. John writes, “In the beginning

¹ Col. i. 16.

⁴ Matt. i. 23.

⁷ 2 Cor. v. 19.

² Heb. i. 3.

⁵ John viii. 58.

⁸ John xiv. 9.

³ Col. i. 17.

⁶ Col. ii. 9.

⁹ Isai. xlv. 5.

was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the *Word was God*.”¹

In the Old Testament it is written, “Thou, even *Thou only*, i. e., *Jehovah*, knowest the hearts of all the children.”² In the New it is written, “He, i. e., *Christ*, knew all men, and needed not that any should testify of man, for He knew what was in man.”³

“Thou⁴ shalt worship,” says the Saviour, “the Lord thy God, and *Him only* shalt thou serve.” “Let all the angels of God,” says David, “worship Him,” i. e., *Christ*.⁵

“Before me,” says Isaiah, “there was no God formed, neither shall there be after me. I, even I, am the Lord, and beside me there is *no Saviour*.”⁶ “Unto you,” says the angel, “is born this day, in the city of David, *a Saviour, which is Christ* the Lord.”⁷

We may notice also the following titles by which the Divinity of our Lord has been acknowledged. He is called, our God—our Great God⁸—our Mighty God⁹—the True God¹⁰—the Lord of Glory¹¹—the King of Kings¹²—and Lord of Lords¹³—the Alpha and Omega—the Beginning and the End, Which is, and Which was, and Which is to come, the Almighty.¹⁴

¹ John i. 1.

⁶ Isai. xliii. 10, 11.

¹¹ 1 Cor. ii. 8.

² 1 Kings viii. 39. ⁷ Luke ii. 11.

¹² Rev. xvii. 14; xix. 16.

³ John ii. 24, 25. ⁸ Tit. ii. 13.

¹³ 1 Tim. vi. 15.

⁴ Matt. iv. 10.

⁹ Isai. ix. 6; x. 21.

¹⁴ Rev. i. 17; xxii. 13.

Heb. i. 6.

¹⁰ 1 John v. 20.

I shall now consider those passages of Scripture which relate to the Personality and Divinity of the Holy Spirit.

Much information respecting the Third Person of the Godhead may be gathered from our Lord's address to His disciples, on the eve of His crucifixion. "I will not leave you comfortless,"¹ said He to them, as He proceeded to bind up their broken spirit, "I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another comforter."²

The distressed disciples, had they been permitted to ask a boon, would probably have begged no more than that their Master would grant them the legacy of future peace and safety. But our Lord bequeathed them a far more precious legacy. He promised them not comfort, but "*The Comforter*," not security, but a *Protector*.

Two terms are employed to sketch out the character of the promised Being.

He is called, 1. Ο ΠΑΡΑΚΛΗΤΟΣ, "the Advocate," (for His office³ was to advocate the cause of the Son of Man,) a term denoting a living agent, and entirely free from any ambiguous sense of impersonality.

Also, 2. ΤΟ ΠΝΕΥΜΑ ΤΟ ΑΓΙΟΝ, "the Spirit, the Holy." But it deserves particular attention that when our Lord employed this term to designate the third person of the Trinity, He invariably coupled

¹ John xiv. 18. ² John xiv. 16. ³ Vide App. p. 76, note (δ).

with the neuter noun, ΠΝΕΥΜΑ, the emphatic word ΕΚΕΙΝΟΣ, in the masculine gender, as in John xvi. 13, ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ΕΚΕΙΝΟΣ ΤΟ ΠΝΕΥΜΑ τῆς ἀληθείας, which, properly rendered, signifies, “when He, i. e., that Person, the Spirit of Truth shall come,” evidently to shew that the word ΠΝΕΥΜΑ is not to be understood of any inanimate substance, but as a personal term denoting an intelligent agent or person.

The *departure* of our Lord is contrasted with the *coming* of the Comforter, as a further intimation of the *personality* of the promised Comforter.

Our Lord seems to reason with his disciples, that it is expedient He should go away, and, *in person*, withdraw from them, otherwise the Comforter could not really, and *in person*, come to them; but if He does really depart, then shall the Holy Ghost as really, and *in person*, come to them, as He came, and shall be sent to them by Him, in the same manner as He was Himself sent to them by the Father. “Nevertheless,” says He, “I tell you the truth: it is expedient for you that I go away. For, if I *go not* away, the Comforter will not *come* unto you. But if I *depart*, I will send Him unto you. As my Father sent me, even so send I the Holy Ghost.”¹

In the evangelical account of the fulfilment of this promise, the coming of the Comforter is re-

¹ John xvi. 7.

lated; and the Comforter himself is described as a Being endowed with mind, choice, and affection, and every other characteristic that can designate an intelligent agent or person. He is *pleased*,¹ *vexed*,² *grieved*,³ *provoked*; has *heard*,⁴ *spoken*,⁵ *received*,⁶ *distributed*,⁷ *willed*;⁸ and he still *guides*⁹ men in all truth, *helps*¹⁰ their infirmities; and *makes intercession*¹¹ for them.

So lively a portraiture is utterly inconsistent with the “science falsely so called,” which teaches that the spirit is an attribute or quality only of the Divine Being. Affections and operations of the mind can be predicated only of a sentient being: and as the Holy Ghost, as described in Scripture, is neither *un-originate* like the Father, nor *begotten* like the Son, but *proceeding*;¹² and as His office¹³ is distinguished from those of the former persons, inasmuch as he is come to “advocate the cause of Christ,” and “to sanctify the elect;” so the Spirit is not only proved to be a *person*, but to be *a person distinct in office and in subsistence* from the Father and the Son.

As regards the Godhead of the Holy Spirit. The Spirit stands before us arrayed in all the fearful attributes of eternity,¹⁴ omniscience,¹⁵ omnipresence,¹⁶

¹ Acts xv. 28.⁶ John xvi. 14.¹¹ Rom. viii. 26.² Isai. lxiii. 10.⁷ 1 Cor. xii. 11.¹² John xv. 26.³ Eph. iv. 30.⁸ 1 Cor. xii. 11.¹³ Vide App. p. 76, note (δ).⁴ John xvi. 13.⁹ John xvi. 13.¹⁴ Heb. ix. 14.⁵ 1 Tim. iv. 1.¹⁰ Rom. viii. 26.¹⁵ 1 Cor. ii. 10.¹⁶ Psal. cxxxix. 7.

omnipotence,—attributes which belong exclusively to Deity, and, consequently, to none to whom the nature of God does not appertain.

He is also the *Inspirer* of the prophets,—the *Sanctifier* of the elect; and His it is to know¹ the mind of God, and to be His Counsellor.²

From Him, as from the lap of plenty, descend all spiritual graces. Holiness, Truth, Love, Glory, all flow from Him as their fountain and real source.

To one He divides the word of wisdom, to another the gift of charity; and the fruit of his workings are Temperance, Meekness, Long-suffering, Gentleness. So that He is clearly that Being whom St. James addressed as “The Father of Lights, with whom there is *no variableness* nor shadow of turning.”³

¹ 1 Cor. ii. 10, 11. There cannot be a clearer proof of the consubstantial nature of the Spirit with the Father, than the statement of St. Paul, “the Spirit searcheth and knoweth the things of God.” In the verses to which I have referred, the Apostle asserts, “the things of God knoweth *no one*,” οὐδεὶς, *i. e.*, neither man nor angel, none but God Himself; and therefore the Spirit who knows the things must necessarily be God Himself. Secondly, he asserts, that the Spirit is with God and in God, as intimately as the soul is in the body. “What man,” says he, “knoweth the things of a man save the Spirit of man which is in Him? *Even so*, the things of God knoweth none but the Spirit of God.”

² 1 Cor. ii. 10. 16. It is evident from Isai. xl. 13, that God has no other counsellor than Himself; consequently since the Spirit is the counsellor, He is God Himself.

³ James i. 17.

Nor could He with propriety be said to dispense gifts according to *His own will*, if He was not truly God. For every being inferior to God performs not his own will, but the will of Him whose minister he is. But of the Holy Ghost it is said “He divideth His gifts to every man severally as *He will*.”¹

There is a sin also which is emphatically called “Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost,” which bears a melancholy stamp of the awful nature of this Being. If the Holy Ghost was by nature inferior to the Father or the Son, sins committed against Him would be less aggravating in their nature than those committed against the Father and Son. But we are told by Christ Himself, that “all manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men; but the blasphemy against the *Holy Ghost* shall *not* be forgiven unto men. Whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever speaketh a word against the *Holy Ghost* it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come.”²

To these proofs of the Divine Essence of the Holy Ghost may be added some which spring from the titles by which he has been addressed.

He is called “*Lord*.” “The Lord direct your hearts into the love of God, and into the patient waiting for Christ.”³

¹ 1 Cor. xii. 11.

² Matt. xii. 31, 32.

³ 2 Thess. iii. 5. The Third Person of the Trinity is here

He is called "*God.*" "Why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost. . . . Thou hast not lied unto man, but unto God."¹

He is called "*the Lord God of Israel, who spake by the mouth of His prophets since the world began.*"² For "holy men," says St. Peter, "spake as they were moved by the *Holy Ghost.*"³

He is called "*the Lord of Hosts,*" who spake to *Isaiah* saying, "Go tell this people, hear ye indeed, but understand not,"⁴ &c.; for St. Paul, referring to the same vision, says, "Well spake *the Holy Ghost* by *Esaias* the prophet, unto our Fathers, saying, Go unto this people and say, hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand,"⁵ &c.

There can be no advantage in pursuing the inquiry further. It is certain the Scriptures teach—First, that the Word and Spirit are two Persons: persons who are distinct from the person of the Father by office, by relationship, and by their mode of subsistence. Secondly, that they are of one substance with the Father: for by forbidding us on the one hand to acknowledge any other than one God, and by demanding our assent on the other hand that the Father is God, the Son is God, and

called "Lord." For the First Person is mentioned in the phrase, "love of God," and the Second is distinctly named "Christ."

¹ Acts v. 3, 4.

² Luke i. 68. 70.

³ 2 Pet. i. 21.

⁴ Isai. vi. 1. 3. 9.

⁵ Acts xxviii. 25.

the Holy Ghost is God, the consubstantial nature of the Three Persons is most clearly expressed.

Thus far then the Scriptures coincide precisely with the doctrine, which is now taught in the Articles, Creeds, and Liturgies of the Church of England.

But it is urged with great vehemence that the doctrine of the Trinity, as it is taught in the Articles and other formularies of faith, in the Postnicene Church, is not *Catholic*: that the Antenicene Fathers, so far from asserting that the Three Persons are *consubstantial*, as the Postnicenes allege, asserted, in opposition, that the Son is of a created mutable essence, and therefore of a different substance from the Father.

This statement is founded upon an imperfect knowledge of the writings of the Antenicene Fathers.

The very contrary is the real case. There is not a single writer whose works have descended to us who has not declared that the Three Persons are of a *consubstantial* nature. Their several testimonies cannot here be adduced, by reason of a prescribed limit; but the truth of this assertion will appear equally conclusive by citing the verdict of a learned and sober judge of the writings of primitive antiquity. It is the summing-up of the evidence which each Antenicene Father has yielded to this very point in question.

“*Thus at length,*” says Bishop Bull, “*have we*

proved by the clearest testimonies, cited from every one of the Antenicene Fathers, whose whole works, or whose fragments, are to be met with, our second Thesis; namely, that the Son of God is consubstantial with God the Father, i. e., not of any created or mutable essence, but altogether of the same Divine incommutable nature with His Father; and therefore it was the constant unanimous opinion of the Catholic doctors who flourished in the three first centuries that He was very God of very God.”¹

And as regards the Third Person of the Trinity, that learned prelate has abundantly proved from the same source, that the Fathers of the three first centuries were unanimous in declaring the Spirit to be consubstantial with the Father. So rare an occurrence was it for the heretics of the three first centuries to venture an attack upon the divinity of the Holy Ghost, that that prelate observes, “*I do not remember that any of the Fathers of the first three centuries have attempted to explain distinctly the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father*

¹ “Itaque tandem luculentissimis testimoniis, e singulis scriptoribus Ante-Nicænis, quorum vel integra scripta, vel fragmenta saltem aliqua reperire potuissemus, adductis, thesim nostram secundam abunde comprobavimus, quæ hæc fuit. Filium Dei Deo Patri ὁμοούσιον, sive consubstantialem, hoc est, non creatæ alicujus aut mutabilis essentiæ, sed ejusdem prorsus cum Patre suo Naturæ Divinæ et incommutabilis, proinde verum Deum ex Deo vero esse, Catholicorum Doctorum, qui tribus primis sæculis floruerunt, constans consorsque fuit sententia.”—Bull, Defens. Fid. Nicæn. sect. ii. c. xiv. § 5.

*and the Son, or from the Father by the Son; there being little or no dispute concerning the divinity of the Holy Ghost till Macedonius (who lived towards the middle of the fourth century) appeared, and disputed the faith of the Church in that Article.”*¹

It is clear, therefore, there is no such discrepancy to be found as has been alleged, between the Post-nicenes and Antenices, and that both have always taught that the Three Persons of the Trinity are *consubstantial*.

But when the Fathers are represented as acknowledging the Three Persons to be consubstantial, it is not to be supposed (as some have done) that the Fathers imagined the divine substance to be of a *Specific* nature.

“*I do take,*” says Stillingfleet, “*the Fathers to have been men of too great sense and capacity to have*

¹ Bull’s Catholic Doctrine concerning the Trinity, vol. ii. p. 8, Oxon, 1827.

The following Fathers have been adduced by Bishop Bull, in his *Defensio Fidei Nicænæ, et Judicium Eccles. Catholicæ, &c.*, as witnesses to the consubstantial nature of the Spirit with the Father. Clemens. Rom. Defens. Fid. Nicæn. sect. ii. c. iii. § 6; Hermas, ib. sect. i. c. ii. § 5; Polycarp, ib. sect. ii. c. iii. § 16; Justin Martyr, Jud. Eccl. Cathol. c. vi. § 12; Tatian, Defens. Fid. Nicæn. sect. ii. c. iv. § 10; Athenagoras, ib. sect. ii. c. iv. § 9; etiam Jud. Eccl. Cathol. c. vi. § 12; Theophilus, Defens. Fid. Nicæn. sect. ii. c. iv. § 10; Irenæus, ib. sect. ii. c. v. § 9; Tertullian, sect. ii. c. vii. § 6 and 7, et sect. iii. c. x. § 8; Hippolytus, ib. sect. iii. c. viii. § 1 and 2; Novatian, ib. sect. ii. c. x. § 6; Dionysius Alex. ib. sect. ii. c. xi. § 11.

*maintained such an absurd opinion as that of a specific nature in God. For either it is a mere logical notion and act of the mind, without any real existence belonging to it as such, which is contrary to the very notion of God, which implies a necessary existence: or it must imply a divine nature, which is neither Father, Son, nor Holy Ghost; which is so repugnant to the doctrine of the Fathers, that no one, that is any ways conversant in their writings on this argument, can imagine they should hold such an opinion.”*¹ The Fathers invariably declared the substance to be of a simple and uncompounded nature, and to be incapable of any division whatever.²

It was stated that, according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers who lived before and after the Council of Nice, the Three Persons of the Trinity are consubstantial, and therefore co-equal in every essential perfection. There is a sense, however, in which, according to the same stream of antiquity, the Three Persons are *not* equal.

The Son is not equal to the Father with respect to his incarnate nature. He is “equal to the Fa-

¹ Stillingfleet Vind. of the Doctrine of the Trinity, p. 77, 8vo., Lond. 1697.

² I have shewn, in the Appendix, p. 77, note (ε), the gross manner in which the early Fathers have been calumniated by M. Le Clerc and Courcelles, and the falsity of the Socinian statement, namely, “That nothing can be said in answer to Courcelles’ proofs that the Fathers held only a specific unity of the Divine Nature, and the Persons to be as so many individuals.”

ther," says the Athanasian Creed, "as touching His Godhead, but inferior to the Father as touching His manhood."

Nor are the Sacred Three without order or rank, even when viewed abstractedly of the Incarnation of the Son.

The Fathers have assigned to the First Person of the Trinity a certain prerogative which they deny to either of the Second or Third Persons. The Father is represented by them as the *Fountain*, the *Origin*, and the *Source*, of the Divinity in the Godhead; while, on the other hand, the Son and Holy Ghost are represented as deriving from Him whatever Divinity they possess, and not as having it from themselves.

They call the Son, God *of* God, Light *of* Light, very God *of* very God. Sometimes *αὐτοθεός*, "very God," but never *αὐτόθεος*, "God of Himself," like the Father.

It was this consideration which led the Ancients to acknowledge the First Person of the Trinity to be *pre-eminent*.

They believed the Father to be un-originate, and therefore they acknowledged Him to be *Supreme*.

They believed the Son to be *begotten* of the Father, and therefore to be subordinate¹ to the Father,

¹ The word "Subordinate" if taken in a popular sense, would imply more than is here intended to be expressed; it would seem to intimate that the Father is greater than the Son in essential perfections, whereas I have frequently asserted that he is not. I have used the term to denote only the *rank* or *order* which exists

but to be subordinate to no other, inasmuch as He is of the *Father alone*, and of no other. They believed the Holy Ghost to be, not “begotten,” but “*proceeding* ;” to be of the Father *and* of the Son,¹ and therefore to be subordinate both to the Father and to the Son.

And as the sacred Three had mutually agreed to enter upon certain official capacities, differing from each other in point of rank, the Father to command, the Son to execute those commands, and the Spirit to go forth as *sent* by the Son ; so, upon this account also, the same rank and order was recognised by them.²

between the sacred Three by virtue of *the different mode of subsistence* of each person in the Divine essence and *the offices* in which each is engaged. Pearson uses the same term when he treats upon the same mysterious doctrine. Vide infra note on p. 33. So also does Sherlock. See his Vindication of the Trinity, p. 18. And Bishop Bull has employed it as the title of the 4th Section of his Defens. Fid. Nicænæ.

¹ Vide Appendix, p. 79, note (ζ).

² “When it is said,” observes Dr. Waterland, “none is afore or after other, none is greater or less than another,” we are not to understand it of *order*. For the Father is first, the Son second, the Holy Ghost third in order. Neither are we to understand it of *office*. For the Father is supreme in office, while the Son and Holy Ghost condescend to inferior offices. But we are to understand it, as the Creed itself explains it, of duration and dignity, in which respect none is *afore* or *after*, none *greater* or *less* ; but the whole Three Persons co-eternal and co-equal.”—Waterland, Commentary on the Athan. Creed, vol. iv. p. 292, Oxford, 1822. Vide Appendix p. 82, note (η).

The pre-eminence of the Father is thus described by Pearson in his exposition of the Apostles’ Creed. “*In the very name of*

The doctrine of the economy of Persons, (for such may be called the doctrine which I have endea-

FATHER, *there is something of eminence, which is not in that of the SON. And some kind of priority we must ascribe unto him whom we call the FIRST, in respect of him whom we term the SECOND Person. And, as we cannot but ascribe it; so must we endeavour to preserve it. Now that privilege or priority consisteth not in this, that the essence or attributes of the one are greater than the essence or attributes of the other; but only in this, that the Father hath that essence of himself; the Son, by communication from the Father. Whence he acknowledgeth, that He is from Him, that he liveth by Him, that the Father gave him to have life in himself. And he generally referreth all things to Him, as received from Him.*

"Wherefore, in this sense, some of the ancients have not stuck to interpret those words, 'the Father is greater than I,' of Christ, as the Son of God, as the Second Person in the blessed Trinity; but still with a reference, not unto his essence, but unto his generation, by which he is understood to have his being from the Father, who only hath it in himself, and who is the original of all power and essence in the Son. 'I can of mine ownself do nothing,' saith our Saviour, because he is not of himself; and whosoever receives his being, must receive his power from another, - especially where the essence and the power are undeniably the same, as in God they are.

"We must not, therefore, so far involve ourselves in the darkness of this mystery, as to deny the glory which is clearly due unto the Father, whose pre-eminence undeniably consisteth in this, that He is God, not of any other, but of Himself; and that there is no other Person who is God, but is God of Him. It is no diminution of the Son to say, that he is from another. For his very name imports as much. But it were a diminution of the Father so to speak of Him, and there must be some pre-eminence, where there is place for derogation. What the Father is, he is from none; what the Son is, he is from the Father.

voured to describe,) has been ably commented upon by the learned Bishop Bull; to whose writings I shall now refer, for proof that I have not dealt un-

What the First is, he giveth; what the second is, he receiveth. The First is a Father, indeed, by reason of his Son; but He is not God by reason of Him. Whereas the Son is not only so in regard to the Father, but he is also God by reason of the same.

“ Upon this pre-eminence, as I conceive, may safely be grounded the congruity of the divine mission.

“ We often read, that Christ was sent. Whence he bears the name of an Apostle himself, as well as those whom he therefore named so; because, as the Father sent him, so sent he them. The Holy Ghost also is said to be sent, sometimes by the Father, sometimes by the Son. But we never read, that the Father was sent at all, there being an authority in that name which seems inconsistent with this mission.

“ Again, the dignity of the Father will yet further appear from the order of the persons in the Blessed Trinity, of which he is undoubtedly the first. For, although in some passages of the Apostolical Discourses, the Son may first be named, and in others the Holy Ghost precedes the Son, yet, where the three persons are barely enumerated and delivered unto us as the rule of faith, there that order is observed which is proper to them, which order hath been perpetuated in all confessions of faith, and is for ever inviolably to be observed. Now this priority doth properly and naturally result from the Divine Paternity; so that the Son must necessarily be second unto the Father, from whom he receiveth his origination, and the Holy Ghost unto the Son.

“ Neither can we be thought to want a sufficient foundation for this priority of the First Person of the Trinity, if we look upon the numerous testimonies of the ancient doctors of the Church, who have not stuck to call the Father the Origin, the Cause, the Author, the Root, the Fountain, and the Head of the Son, of the whole Trinity.”—Pearson on the Creed, p. 50—56, 8vo. 1832

fairly with the Fathers. “ *The manner of speaking (says he) of some moderns, in which they call the Son ‘ God of,’ or ‘ from Himself,’ is plainly repugnant to the Nicene Synod and the opinion of all Catholic Doctors who wrote before and after it.*”

“ *The Catholic Doctors, both before and after the Synod of Nice, have unanimously determined, that God the Father is greater than the Son, even with respect to His Divinity, namely, not IN NATURE, or any ESSENTIAL PERFECTION, which is in the Father and not in the Son ; but in AUTHORITY, i. e.,*

In the eighth Article he treats again upon the same doctrine as it relates to each Person of the Trinity.

“ *As there is a number in the Trinity, by which the Persons are neither more nor less than Three, so there is also an order, by which, of these Persons the Father is first, the Son the second, and the Holy Ghost the third. Nor is this order arbitrary or external, but internal and necessary, by virtue of a subordination of the second unto the first, and of the third unto the first and second. The Godhead was communicated from the Father to the Son, not from the Son unto the Father. Though, therefore, this were done from all eternity, and so there can be no priority of time, yet there must be acknowledged a priority of order, by which the Father, not the Son, is first, and the Son, not the Father, second. Again, the same Godhead was communicated by the Father and the Son unto the Holy Ghost, not by the Holy Ghost to the Father or the Son. Though, therefore, this was also done from all eternity, and, therefore, can admit of no priority in reference to time, yet that of order must be here observed ; so that the Spirit, receiving the Godhead from the Father, who is the first Person, cannot be the first ; receiving the same from the Son, who is the second, cannot be the second ; but, being from the first and second, must be, of the three, the third.*”—*Ib.* p. 482:

ORIGINAL ALONE, *as the Son is from the Father, not the Father from the Son.*"

"*The ancient Doctors thought this doctrine of the subordination of the Son to the Father, as His ORIGINAL and PRINCIPLE, very useful and necessary to be known and believed; because by this especially the Divinity of the Son may be asserted, and the unity of the Divine Monarchy preserved entire notwithstanding. For though the name and nature be common to two, namely, to the Father and His Son, yet because the one is THE PRINCIPLE of the other, from which he is propagated, and that by an interior, not an exterior production, God is truly said to be one. This reason those Ancients did also believe equally to belong to the Divinity of the Holy Ghost.*"¹

¹ The words which I have quoted are the theses of three chapters. They are, therefore, to be considered not as a mere assertion on the part of Bishop Bull, but rather as an assertion which that learned prelate *proves* to be *correct*. His words are as follows:—"Proponitur Thesis prima, de subordinatione Filii ad Patrem, ut ad sui originem ac principium. Quæ et unanimi veterum consensu confirmatur. Ostenditur locutionem illam quorundam Neotericorum qua Filium dicunt *ἀυτόθεον* hoc est, a seipso Deum, sententiæ Synodi ipsius Nicænæ adeoque Catholicorum Doctorum omnium tum qui ante tum qui post istam scripsere Synodum prorsus repugnare."—Bull, Defens. Fid. Nicæn. sec. iv. cap. 1.

"Catholici Doctores tum qui Synodo Nicæna anteriores fuere, tum qui postmodum vixerunt, unanimi consensu Deum Patrem etiam secundum Divinitatem Filio majorem esse statuerunt: nempe non natura quidem, aut perfectione aliqua essentiali, quæ

There is an aspect then, under which, according to the universal suffrage of the Fathers, the Three Persons are *co-equal*, and an aspect also under which there is gradation and order amongst them.

In *essential Perfections*, it is determined that the Father is *not* greater than the Son or the Holy Ghost. For it was shewn before (when treating upon the substance of the Persons) that there is no essential Perfection in one Person that is not in the other, but that the Three Persons are consubstantial, co-eternal, and co-equal.

In the “*Economy of Persons*,” however, it is determined that there is gradation and order; for, from what has been now lately stated, the Father ranks Supreme, the Son as Second in order, and the Holy Ghost as Third in order. For the doctrine of the “*Economy*” asserts, that the Father is unoriginate; the Son has His origin in the Father; and the Spirit has His origin both in the Father and in

in Patre sit, et non Filio: sed auctoritate sola, hoc est origine: quoniam a Patre est Filius, non a Filio Pater.”—*Ib.* cap. 2.

“Doctrinam de subordinatione Filii ad Patrem, ut ad sui originem ac principium, ideo cognitu credituque perutilem ac plane necessariam esse antiqui Doctores existimarunt: quod hac imprimis ratione ita Filii Divinitas asseratur, ut nihilominus Dei unitas et Monarchia Divina sarta tecta conservetur. Scilicet quamvis duobus, nempe Patre et Filio Dei nomen et natura communis sit; tamen quoniam alter alterius est principium, a quo propagatur idque interiori productione, non externa; fit ut Deus esse unicus mento dicatur. Quam rationem pariter ad Spiritus Sancti Divinitatem pertinere prisci illi crediderunt.”—*Ib.* cap. 4.

the Son ; and that the office of the Father is superior to that of the Son, and that of the Son superior to that of the Holy Ghost.

From what has been now stated, it must appear conclusive, that the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity which is set forth in the Articles, Creeds, &c. of the Established Church of England, claims for itself the universal suffrage of antiquity, and is perfectly consistent in all its parts.”¹

An important question, however, still remains to be decided, namely, whether it is absolutely requisite that men should embrace the Catholic faith of the Doctrine of the Trinity as Necessary to salvation. The Postnicens assert, that “*except a man keep the Catholic faith whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.*”² It is important therefore to know, whether these sentiments are peculiar to the Postnicene Church, or whether the Antenicenes also held the same sentiments. If the

¹ I have dwelt the longer upon this branch of the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity because it has been urged by Dr. Priestley and others, that “the Trinity of the present day differs essentially from the Trinity of the early ages ; inasmuch as the modern Trinity contains Three Persons in all respects equal, no one of which is *supreme* ; while the ancient Trinity contained Three *wholly unequal* Persons, among whom *supremacy* was ascribed to the Father.”—Vide Faber’s Apostolicity of Trinitarianism, vol. ii. p. 251.

Others also have asserted that the Doctrine of the Trinity, as it is now held by the Established Church of England, contradicts itself, and is, therefore, with good cause, to be rejected.

² Athanas. Creed.

latter were indifferent as to the importance of the doctrine, the Postnicens may be justly censured with practising an unprecedented severity towards the members of the Church. But if the Antenicenes were as rigorous as the Postnicens in enforcing faith in this Doctrine, the Necessity of the Doctrine, and the present decision of the Church, can be no longer called in question.

The readiest means of ascertaining the sentiments of the Antenicene Church concerning the Necessity of Faith in the Holy Trinity, is to consider, First, the manner in which the Church treated those persons who rejected the Catholic faith of the Trinity in Unity.

That the Church fulminated her anathema upon the several ringleaders of the Gnostic school is notorious. But as those persons would not now be called Christians in any sense of the term, I shall dismiss their history, and direct my inquiry exclusively to such as would be called heretics, in the modern acceptation of the term "heretic," i. e., *"men who professed to receive the whole of Christianity, who appealed to the same Scriptures as the standard of their faith; but who held opinions which have been pronounced by the Church to be erroneous."*¹

¹ "I have already," says Dr. Burton, "said enough concerning the definition of the term '*Heresy*,' and have shewn [vide p. 8—12] that it is not restricted by the Fathers to the sense which it bears now. According to the modern signification of the term

Theodotus of Byzantium is the earliest instance that we have of an individual who can be called an *heretic*, in this acceptation of the term. He lived towards the close of the second century, or, as some historians relate, in the year of our Lord 190. And when the sword of persecution was raised against him, he apostatised from the true faith, and introduced the modern Unitarian doctrine, that Jesus Christ was a mere man.

The novelty, as well as the particular nature of his doctrines, is noticed in the following words by Tertullian :—

“ Besides these there was one Theodotus of Byzantium, who being apprehended as a Christian,

there was no heretic in the time of the Apostles ; for the Gnostics, who, whether they believed Jesus to be a phantom or no, all agreed in believing that Christ descended upon Jesus at his baptism, would not now be spoken of as Christians in any sense of the term. The Fathers have expressly stated that they were not Christians, and yet they called them heretics, which shews very plainly in what sense the term heretic was then used. But if we mean by an heretic a man who professes to receive the whole of Christianity ; who appeals to the same Scriptures as the standard of his faith ; but who holds opinions which have been pronounced by the Church to be erroneous ; in this sense there was no heretic in the time of the Apostles ; at least, there was none to whom allusion is made in the Apostolic writings.”

“ The heresies of the first century were introduced by men who did not acknowledge the Apostles ; they took as much of Christianity as suited their purpose, and engrafted it upon a philosophy which had already been compounded out of several different systems.”—Bampt. Lect. p. 227.

*denied his profession, and ever after blasphemed Christ; for he INTRODUCED the doctrine of His being purely man, and denied His Divinity. He held indeed that he was born of the Virgin by the Holy Ghost, but, being only and barely man, was in nothing superior to other men but only in justice."*¹

For this denial of the Catholic faith, we are informed by Caius,² that sentence of excommunication was passed upon him by Victor, then Bishop of

¹ "Accedit his Theodotus hæreticus Byzantius; qui posteaquam Christi pro nomine comprehensus negavit, in Christum blasphemare non destitit: doctrinam enim introduxit, qua Christum hominem tantummodo diceret, Deum autem illum negaret. Ex Spiritu quidem Sancto natum ex Virgine, sed hominem solitarium atque nudum, nulla alia præ cæteris, nisi sola justitiæ auctoritate." —Tertull. de Præscript. Hæret. p. 223.

Commentators have observed that Cerinthus and Ebion had done the same before. "But this," says Dr. Burton, "is by no means true. Those heretics did not deny *Christ*, but *Jesus*, to be divine; and Theodotus appears to have been the *first* who, without separating *Jesus* from *Christ*, asserted that Jesus Christ was a mere human being. Many heretics had denied *Jesus* to be God, and many Christians had gone over to the same creed; but Theodotus was the *first Christian* who openly taught that Christ was a mere man, and he did not live till the end of the second century."—Bampt. Lect. p. 247.

Indeed, it is very doubtful whether Theodotus went so far as to maintain what is now called the simple humanity of Christ, or that *any evidence can be produced of the proper Unitarian doctrines being held in the three first centuries.*—See the Appendix, p. 83, note (θ).

² Vide Euseb. Eccles. Hist. lib. v. c. 28, and Valesius's note, in loc.

Rome; and that Theodotus was pronounced to be an heretic, beyond the pale of salvation, according to the old proverb, "out of the Church no salvation."

There can be no necessity for pointing out what were the sentiments of the Antenicene Church concerning the importance of faith in the Holy Trinity, when it is known that she visited with so severe a punishment as *Excommunication*, the offence of denying the doctrine of the Trinity.

But such was her invariable mode of proceeding against all those persons who denied the Catholic faith. In later times she visited the same punishment upon Artemon, Beryllus of Bostra, Paul of Samosata, and others who stood charged with similar offences to that of Theodotus. Their heresies differed in certain points from each other; but the Church, in delivering her sentence of Excommunication, made no difference whether the peculiar notions of one heretic approached *apparently* nearer to the truth than those of another. All who did not attain to the truth itself were judged to have fallen short of the truth. If Jesus Christ was not confessed to be truly God, that is, in a sense free from all artful evasions of the term God, they who refused their assent were brought under one common charge of having denied the Lord, and for that reason sentence of Excommunication was indiscriminately passed upon them.¹

¹ "Some of our modern Arians," observes Bishop Bull, "may

If we examine the *Creeds* which were recited in the Antenicene Church, we shall derive another proof of the necessity of Faith in the doctrine of the Holy Trinity.

It is universally admitted, that whatever doctrines were contained in the *Creeds*, were always considered as necessary, above all others, to be believed for salvation. I shall show, therefore, that the doctrine of the Trinity, as it is now professed by the Church, was always expressed in sense in the *Creed recited in the Antenicene Church*.

Many have supposed that the earliest form of Creed proceeded no further than the words, “ *I*

here object, that all the heretics afore-mentioned denied that Christ was before Mary, which the Arians acknowledge—yea, they confess that he was before all ages ; therefore all that is urged, howmuch-soever it may concern the Socinians, does not at all affect the Arians. But this is nothing to the purpose. For it is plain, that the heretics afore-mentioned were condemned by the Church, for a reason common to them with the Arians themselves, namely, for denying that our Saviour was God. Look back upon what has been observed in this chapter concerning Theodotus, Artemon, and Paul of Samosata, from the ancients, and you will see that the Fathers place every one of their heresies in this, not that they made our Saviour a Being lower in the Creation than he really was, but that they made him a mere creature, and did not own him as truly God. In a word, they were convicted of, and condemned for, a *heresy* that denied God, as Caius says of Theodotus and Artemon, and the Antiochian Fathers of Paul of Samosata.”—Jud. Eccl. Cathol. c. iii. § 9.

*believe in the Father, and in the Son, and in the Holy Ghost."*¹

¹ Of this opinion were Erasmus ad Cens. Paris, Tit. ii.; Vossius de Symbol. Diss. i. n. 38; Stillingfleet, Vind. Trin. p. 178; Bull, Jud. Eccl. Cathol. c. iii. § 3, c. vi. § 80; Wall, Hist. of Infant Bapt. part ii. c. ix. sect. ii. p. 491, &c.

Episcopus was also of the same opinion: "Antiquissimum, quodque in prima baptismi administratione jam inde ab ipsis apostolorum temporibus usitabatur, hoc erat. Credo in Deum Patrem, Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum; nempe ad præscriptam ab ipso Jesu formulam."—Institut. lib. iv. c. xxxiv. p. 340.

But Episcopus, it is to be observed, differed entirely from the former with regard to the inference which was to be drawn from such a consideration. Episcopus asserted that the earliest Creeds went no further than the words prescribed by our Lord for Baptism, for the sake of proving that the eternal generation of the Son, was not inserted in the Creeds at the beginning. But to this it has been very justly observed by Bull, Jud. Eccl. Cathol. c. iv. § 3, that the short Creed mentioned by Episcopus expressed the doctrine of the Trinity in a clearer, closer, and stronger manner than the more enlarged Creeds afterwards did. For the insertion of additional articles, time after time, carried the words Son, and Holy Ghost, so far from the word God, that it might look as if that title, which belonged indifferently to all three, was there applied to the Father only; though the compilers of those larger Creeds really designed the same common application of the name God as before. "Hence," says Dr. Waterland, "*it appears that, allowing Episcopus the supposition which he goes upon, in relation to the short concise form of the first baptismal Creed, yet it is so far from favouring his cause, that it makes against him, since that form so worded carries in it, a confession of the Three divine Persons being the one true God of the Christians; and if the Creed in the first age contained no more, then that very doctrine must have been looked upon*

The supposition may be admitted as fair and probable; but if we call to mind the remark that was lately made, *i. e.*, that the Antenicenes were unanimous in pronouncing the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, to be of a consubstantial nature; it must appear conclusive, that even in so short a form as this, the words, “I believe in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost,” proceeding from the lips of the Antenicene Church, was an honest confession of faith in a consubstantial Trinity.

But the sense which was merely implied in this, the *supposed earliest* form of Creed, is fully expressed in words in those forms of the Antenicene Creed which occur in the writings of the early Fathers.

The Creed of Gregory Thaumaturgus describes the Three Persons in the following terms:—

“*A perfect Trinity in glory, and eternity, and dominion, neither divided nor separated.*” And it terminates with this confession:—“*There is therefore nothing created or servile in this Trinity, or adventitious, as if it existed not before, but was afterwards introduced. For the Son was never wanting to the Father, nor the Spirit to the Son; but this Trinity is eternally the same, unchangeable and invariable.*”¹

The consubstantial nature of the Trinity could

from the beginning, as the sum and substance of Christianity.”—

Import. of the Doctr. of the Trinity, c. vi.

¹ For the complete form of this Creed, vide App. p. 91.

not possibly have been stated in more express terms than it has been by this Bishop of Neo-Cæsarea. The genuineness of the Creed, it is true, has been denied by the Arians; but the arguments which they have advanced to impugn its genuineness, are not only futile in themselves, but there is the undeniable evidence, both of Gregory Nyssen and St. Basil, that it is the genuine work of the Bishop, whose title it bears.¹

If we carry on the inquiry to other forms of the Creed, we shall find many instances in which the clause which speaks of the Second Person of the Trinity, is swelled to a very considerable extent with phrases, which mark in the most emphatic manner, the consubstantial nature of the Father and the Son.

Thus, in the Creed recited by Origen, the Confession of Faith states, "*I believe in Jesus Christ, who was begotten of the Father before every creature, who is God, and who when he was made man continued the same God as before.*"²

By Lucian Martyr—"In Jesus Christ, his only-begotten Son—who is God—God of God—whole of whole—one of one—perfect of perfect—King of King—Lord of Lord. . . . who was at the beginning with God, the Word God."³

¹ For the evidence which these two writers have yielded, as well as for a full vindication of the genuineness of the Creed, vide App. p. 84, note (1).

² For the complete form of this Creed, vide App. p. 93.

³ For the complete form of this Creed, vide App. p. 95.

In the Creed which was used when Eusebius was baptised¹—“*In one Lord Jesus Christ—the word of God—God of God—Light of Light—Life of Life—His only-begotten Son. . . . begotten of the Father before all ages,*” &c.

¹ Eusebius was born about the year of our Lord 270, or as some think sooner.—[Vide Vales. de Vit. et Script. Euseb. Cæs. sub init., and Lardner’s Credibility, vol. iv. p. 70.] And was baptized in the year 285, or at the latest 290.

The Historian tells us, in the preface to his Creed, that the several articles which he has specified in the Creed are of a very ancient date: that they had descended by regular tradition from Bishop to Bishop, and that they came originally from the pure word of God itself. His words are, “*As we have received by tradition from our predecessors the Bishops, both, when we were instructed in the first principles of the Faith, and received baptism; and as we have learnt from the Divine Scriptures, and as during our continuance in the Presbytership, and also since we have been intrusted with a bishopric, we have believed and taught; so we also now believe, and do make a public declaration to you of our Faith, which is this,*” &c. “Καθὼς παρελάβομεν παρὰ τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν ἐπισκόπων, καὶ ἐν τῇ κατηχήσει, καὶ ὅτε τὸ λουτρὸν ἐλάβομεν, καὶ καθὼς ἀπὸ τῶν Θείων γραφῶν μεμαθήκαμεν, καὶ ὡς ἐν τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ, καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἐπισκοπῇ ἐπιστεύσαμεν τε καὶ ἐδιδάσκομεν, οὕτω καὶ νῦν πιστεύοντες τὴν ἡμετέραν πίστιν ὑμῖν προσαναφέρομεν.”—Socrat. Eccl. Hist. lib. i. c. viii. p. 23. And then follows the Creed, as I have given it in the Appendix, p. 97.

The draft therefore which Eusebius has given of the Cæsarean Creed may fairly be considered as a correct epitome, not only of the faith of the Church at the time when he was baptized, but also of the faith which had been handed down by tradition through the several ages which preceded his baptism.

In the Creed as it occurs in the Apostolical Constitutions¹—“*In Jesus Christ—His only-Begotten Son—who before all ages was begotten,*” &c.

In these instances, by either of the phrases “*God of God*”—“*Only-Begotten*”—or “*Begotten before all ages*”—it may be said that the Son is declared positively to be of one substance with the Father.

First. The phrase “*God of God*” declares the Son to be of one substance with the Father.

If the Son had been simply called God, some question might possibly arise respecting the exact sense of the term God, since men and angels are stiled God in Scripture. But in these Creeds the Son is called “*God of God*:” a phrase which will admit of no ambiguous sense whatever. The phrase interprets itself. “*God of God*” can be understood in no other sense than “*Bone of Bone*” and “*Flesh of Flesh*.” By the latter a participation or unity of substance is always understood, and so must it be understood by the former also.

Secondly. The Son is declared to be of one

¹ “Whatever,” says Cardinal Bona, “may be said of the author of these Constitutions, all agree that it is certain and evident they were more ancient than the Council of Nice, and that in them is contained the discipline of the Christian Church before Constantine the Great, as the learned Morinus (*De Sacris Ordin. pars. ii. p. 20*) tells us, to whom Joannes Fronto (*In Prænotatis. ad Calendar. Rom. sect. v.*) assents, in his observations before the Roman Calendar.”—*De Rerum. Liturg. i. cap. viii. sect. 4.* For the complete form of the Creed, vide App. p. 99.

substance with the Father, by his title, "*Only-Begotten.*"

The title "*Only-Begotten*" cannot, in the language of *Scripture*, be understood either of Christ's conception by the Holy Ghost; nor of His mediatorial office; nor of His becoming the first-begotten from the dead; nor of His being made Heir of all things.¹ "*None of these circumstances,*" says Waterland, "*singly considered, nor all together, will be sufficient to account for the title of Only Son or Only-Begotten;*" but in *Scripture* the title "*Only-Begotten*" always refers to the pre-existent and *divine* nature of the Word: to that state in which he was the only-Begotten from all eternity.

Nor can it, in the language of the Fathers by whom it was used, be understood in any other sense than that which implies the eternal generation of the Son from the substance of the Father. "*The title of the 'Only-Begotten,' or 'Only Son' of God,*" says Bishop Bull, "*given to Christ, is plainly determined, by the constant and perpetual use of all Catholic Doctors, to mean his Divine generation from God the Father before all ages: all of them agree with that of Tertullian concerning the Son of God. 'He is the First-begotten, as being begotten before*

¹ Episcopius asserts that it is according to the four ways here mentioned that Christ is by way of eminence called God in *Scripture*.—*Episcop. tom. i. p. 335.*

*all things : and the only-Begotten, as being alone begotten of God, properly out of the womb of his heart.' For all of them owned no other Son of God than He who was begotten of the very essence of God the Father.'*¹

In the third place it is to be observed, that the Church took considerable pains to preserve the sense in which the term "only-Begotten" has been explained (*i. e.*, to shew that it signified the divine generation of the Son from the eternal essence of the Father) from any misrepresentation : for when heretics gave out that Christ was begotten only in a metaphorical sense, and that he was created in time, and therefore not begotten of the substance of the Father ; the Church, to shew, in opposition, that the Son was *not created* in time, but that He was *a real Son, begotten of the eternal essence of a real Father*, added to the term "only-Begotten" the explanatory phrase, "*begotten of the Father before all ages.*"

When then the term "only-Begotten" signifies,

¹ "Titulus Filii Dei *unigeniti* sive *unici*, Christo tributus, constanti ac perpetuo catholicorum omnium doctorum usu in hunc sensum plane determinatus fuit, ut divinam ejus ante omnia sæcula ex ipso Deo Patre generationem significaret. Illud Tertulliani (Adv. Prax. c. 7.) de Filio Dei est vox omnium consona. 'Primogenitus, ut ante omnia genitus, et Unigenitus, ut solus ex Deo genitus, proprie de vulva cordis ipsius,' nam illi omnes non alium Filium Dei unigenitum agnoverunt, quam qui ex ipsa Dei Patris essentia, genitus fuerit."—Bull, Jud. Eccl. Cathol. v. § 10.

both in Scripture and in the language of the Fathers, the divine generation of the Son from the eternal essence of the Father; and when it is well known that the Fathers added the phrase “ Begotten before all ages” for the express purpose of insisting upon, and shewing that such was the true sense in which that term was to be received; can it be said that the Nicene Fathers have inserted any *new* idea when they added to the Creed the phrase “ *of one substance with the Father.*” For it is quite certain that the phrase “ of one substance with the Father” was never intended to suggest any idea beyond that which was always implied by the phrases “ only-Begotten” and “ Begotten before all ages;” for, in the form in which the Creed was first drawn up, the words of the second Article are “ *In one Lord Jesus Christ: the only-Begotten, THAT IS, of the substance of the Father.*”¹ And in the form in which the Creed occurs in Epiphanius the second Article is, “ *In one Lord Jesus Christ: begotten of the Father before all ages, THAT IS, of the substance of his Father.*”² Which shews clearly that the Nicene Fathers considered the terms “ only-Begotten”—“ Begotten of the Father before all ages”—and “ of one substance with the Father,”—as synonymous modes of expressing one idea, *i. e.*, the

¹ For the complete form of this Creed, vide App. p. 101.

² For the complete form of this Creed, vide App. p. 103.

divine generation of the Son from the eternal essence of the Father.”¹

It may with truth therefore be asserted, that in the Antenicene forms of the Creed the consubstantial nature of the Trinity was always implied and

¹ In the writings of Socrates Scholasticus there is extant a letter of Eusebius in which the latter professes to explain the two terms γεννηθείς, “begotten,” and ὁμοούσιος, “of one substance,” according to the genuine sense of the Nicene Synod.

Alluding to the former, Eusebius writes: “*For the same reasons we have admitted also of these words ‘begotten, not made.’ For made, said they, (i. e., the Nicene Bishops,) is a common term attributed to all other creatures which were made by the Son, of whom the Son hath no resemblance. Wherefore he is no creature like to those which were created by him; but he is of a far more excellent substance than any creature, which substance, as the sacred oracles do instruct us, is begotten of the Father, but by such a manner of generation as is ineffable and inexpressible by any created being.* Κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ δὲ, καὶ τὸ γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα, κατεδεξάμεθα, ἐπειδὴ τὸ ποιηθέν, κοινὸν ἔφασκον εἶναι πρόσρημα τῶν λοιπῶν κτισμάτων τῶν διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ γενομένων. ὧν οὐδὲν ὅμοιον ἔχειν τὸν υἱόν. διὸ δὴ μὴ εἶναι αὐτὸν ποίημα, τοῖς δὲ αὐτοῦ γενομένοις ὅμοιον κρείττονος δὲ ἢ κατὰ πᾶν ποίημα τυγχάνειν οὐσίας, ἣν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεγενῆσθαι διδάσκει τὰ Θεῖα λόγια, οὗ τρόπου τῆς γεννήσεως ἀνεκφράστου καὶ ἀνεπιλογίστου πάση γεννετῇ φύσει τυγχάνοντος.”

In reference to the latter term he adds: “*To be of the same substance with the Father,’ doth expressly represent to us no more than this, namely, that the Son of God hath no community with, or resemblance to, created beings; but that in every respect he is like to the Father only, who hath begotten him, and that he does exist of no other substance or essence, but of the Father.* Παραστατικὸν δὲ εἶναι τῷ πατρὶ τὸ ὁμοούσιον τὸ μηδεμίαν ἐμφέρειαν

understood. And since it is generally conceded that it is the practice of the Church to incorporate in her Creed those doctrines which she considers to be most important, it is evident that the Antenicene Church considered the doctrine of the Holy Trinity to be one of the most important doctrines of Christianity.

There is a third way in which the Antenicenes may be said to have asserted the Necessity of faith in the doctrine of the Trinity.

It appears from their writings that man cannot obtain remission of sins, and become regenerate, unless the faith into which he is baptised acknowledges that the Three Persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are of a consubstantial nature. To make the judgment of the Antenicenes the more clear on this matter, I shall shew from their writings, first, that it is the proper effect of baptism to make the body the temple of an *undivided consubstantial Trinity* of Persons. Secondly, that the baptism which does not make the body the temple

πρὸς τὰ γεννητὰ κτίσματα τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐμφαίνειν· μόνῳ δὲ τῷ πατρὶ τῷ γεγενήκοτι κατὰ πάντα τρόπον ἁφωμοίωσθαι, καὶ μὴ εἶναι ἐξ ἑτέρας τὲ ὑποστάσεως καὶ οὐσίας, ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς."—Socrat. Scholast. Hist. Eccl. lib. i. c. viii. If the Reader compares the two expositions together, he will find an additional proof of what was stated above, i. e., that the Nicene Fathers attached precisely the same sense to the term *ὁμοούσιος*, "of one substance," that they did to *μονογενής*, "only-begotten," and that the two terms were intended by them to be synonymous.

of *an undivided consubstantial Trinity* of Persons can confer no benefit whatever upon the recipient.

1. That it is the proper effect of baptism to make the body the temple of an *undivided consubstantial Trinity* of Persons.

Justin Martyr, in his *Apology* for the Christians, describes the rite of baptism, and the effect produced by baptism, in the following manner:—
“I will now,” says he, *“declare to you also after what manner we, being made new by Christ, have dedicated ourselves to God. . . . we bring men to some place where there is water; and they are regenerated by the same way of regeneration by which we were regenerated: for they are washed with water in the name of God, the Father and Lord of all things, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit.”*¹ In this passage it will be observed, that the person is pronounced by Justin Martyr to be regenerated by being washed in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and that Justin calls the washing in the name of the Trinity the dedicating themselves to God.

Tertullian in a similar manner represents bap-

¹ “Ὁν τρόπον δὲ καὶ ἀνεθήκαμεν ἑαυτοὺς τῷ Θεῷ, καινοποιηθέντες διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐξηγησόμεθα. . . . Ἀγονται ὑφ’ ἡμῶν ἔνθα ὕδωρ ἐστὶ, καὶ τρόπον ἀναγεννήσεως ὃν καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοὶ ἀνεγεννήθημεν, ἀναγεννώμεθα. Ἐπ’ ὀνόματος γὰρ τοῦ Πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων καὶ Δεσπότου Θεοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ Πνεύματος ἁγίου τὸ ἐν τῷ ὕδατι τότε λουτρὸν ποιοῦνται.”—Justin. Martyr. *Apol.* 1. cap. lxi.

tism as a spiritual laver in which the body is cleansed from the pollution of sin, and made the temple of a consubstantial Trinity. “*The washing away of sins,*” he says, “*is obtained by Faith sealed in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.*”¹ And again: “*In Baptism we are dipped not once, but thrice, at every name, to shew that we are baptised into Three Persons.*”² “*Which Three Persons,*” he adds, in another place, “*are ONE THING (unum), not one person (unus), as it is written, I and the Father are one, with respect to unity of substance, not of numerical individuality.*”³

Origen also, speaking of baptism, says, “*By virtue of the invocations, it is made the spring and fountain of spiritual graces, to every one that dedicates himself to the Divinity or Godhead of the adorable Trinity.*”⁴

¹ “Angelus baptismi arbiter superventuro Spiritui Sancto vias dirigit ablutione delictorum, quam fides impetrat, obsignata in Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto.”—Tertull. de Bapt. c. vi. p. 226.

² Novissime mandans, ut tingerent in Patrem, et Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum. Nam nec semel, sed ter, ad singula nomina in singulas personas tingimur.”—Tertull. contr. Prax. cap. xxvi. Vide Appendix, p. 104, note (κ).

³ “Qui tres *unum* sint, non unus; quomodo dictum est, Ego et Pater unum sumus; ad substantiæ unitatem, non ad numeri singularitatem.”—Adv. Praxeam. c. xxv. p. 515.

⁴ “Τῷ ἐμπερέχοντι ἑαυτὸν τῇ θεότητι τῆς προσκυνήτης Τριάδος διὰ τῆς δυνάμεως τῶν ἐπικλησέων, χαρισμάτων ἀρχὴν ἔχε καὶ πηγὴν.”—Origen Cit. Apud. Basil. de Spir. S. c. 29.

In our present copies the passage is read somewhat differently,

These passages, I consider, are sufficient to shew, that, in the judgment of the Antenicens, the proper effect of baptism, is to make the body the temple of an *undivided consubstantial Trinity*—Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

I shall now cite a few passages in proof of the second position, namely, that the Antenicens judged that the baptism which does *not* make the body the temple of a *consubstantial Trinity* can confer no benefit whatever upon the recipient.

St. Cyprian¹ argues against the validity of heretical baptism in the following manner:—

“ If a man could be baptised by heretics he might also obtain remission of sins. If he obtained re-

though much the same in sense: “ Τῷ ἐμπερέχοντι ἑαυτὸν τῇ θειότητι τῆς δυνάμεως τῶν τῆς προσκυνήτης Τριάδος ἐπικλησέων ἐστὶν ἡ χαρισμάτων Θεῶν ἀρχὴ καὶ πηγὴ.”—Origen Comm. in John, p. 124. Ed. Heut.

¹ It might perhaps be objected against the citations which I have made from St. Cyprian, that his opinions respecting the admission of persons who had received heretical baptism into the Church, were not universally allowed by the other Bishops. But such an objection can carry no weight at all with the present argument, for the disputes which then agitated the African churches bear no resemblance whatever to the present point in question. The point in question is, “ whether the baptism which does not make the body the temple of an *undivided consubstantial Trinity* can make the body the temple of God.” This question St. Cyprian determines in the negative, and it is impossible to produce a single Father who has differed from him on this matter.

*mission of sins, and was sanctified and made the temple of God ; I ask of what God? If you say of the Creator, I answer, that he who believed not in Him, could not be His Temple. If you say of Christ, I answer, that neither can he who denies Christ to be God become the Temple of Christ. If you say of the Holy Ghost, since the Three are One, I ask, how can the Holy Ghost be reconciled to him who is at enmity with the Son or the Father."*¹

St. Cyprian, in this passage, asserts that man cannot, by baptism, be made the temple of God if he denies the doctrine of a consubstantial Trinity ; and, therefore, man must either be made the temple of that undivided Trinity, or he can be made the temple of no God whatever.

In another passage the same writer asks—" *How, then, do some say that a Gentile, who is baptised out of the Church, and even contrary to the Church, provided it be done in the name of Jesus Christ, anywhere, and in any manner, can obtain remission of*

¹ " Si baptizari quis apud Hæreticos potuit : utique et remissam peccatorum consequi potuit. Si peccatorum remissam consecutus est, et sanctificatus est, et templum Dei factus est ; quæro cujus Dei? Si Creatoris, non potuit qui in eum non credidit : si Christi, nec hujus fieri potest Templum, qui negat Deum Christum : si Spiritus Sancti, cum tres unum sint, quomodo Spiritus Sanctus placatus esse ei potest, qui aut Filii aut Patris inimicus est."—Cyprian ad Jubai. Ep. 73, p. 203.

sins, when Christ himself orders all nations to be baptised in the full and united Trinity.”¹

The observation which Cyprian makes in this passage is precisely similar to that which he made in the preceding one. He shews that it is impossible for man to derive any spiritual benefit from that baptism which is administered in the faith of one Person only of the Trinity, being God ; for the *Three* Persons, he adds, are *One* God ; and, therefore, unless a man is baptised into the “ full undivided Trinity” he can be baptised into no God whatever.

And it was to the same effect that Hippolytus spake before him. He opposes the modern Arian doctrine with the following words:—“ *I speak of ONE—we cannot form a conception of ONE GOD in any other way, unless we really believe in the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost.*” And he proceeds to shew that it was into such a faith that Christ ordained men should be baptised: “ *The Paternal Word; therefore, knowing the dispensation and the will of the Father, that the Father wished to be glorified in no other way than this (i. e., as was stated above), commanded his disciples after his resurrection, in these words, ‘ Go teach all nations, baptising them in the*

¹ “ Quomodo ergo quidam dicunt foris extra Ecclesiam, imo contra Ecclesiam, modo in nomine Jesu Christi, ubicunque et quomodocunque Gentilem baptizatum remissionem peccatorum consequi posse ; quando ipse Christus Gentes baptizari jubeat in plena et adunata Trinitate ?”—Ep. 73. p. 206.

*name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,' shewing that whoever omits ANY ONE OF THESE does not PERFECTLY glorify God; for by this TRINITY the Father is glorified."*¹

And if the question had been put to Tertullian, who lived before him, why *God* is not glorified *perfectly* when either of the Three are excluded? and why the Father is glorified by that whole *Trinity*? he would have told us, in the same manner as Hippolytus has done, "*Because by their indivisibility the one can neither be known nor unknown without the other.*"²

If, then, from these passages it appears conclusive that man cannot be made the temple of God, and be accounted regenerate, unless he is baptised into a consubstantial Trinity—Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,—the Necessity of faith in the doctrine of the Holy Trinity can be no longer a point of question.

¹ " Δύο μὲν οὐκ ἔρῳ Θεοῦς ἄλλ' ἢ ἓνα ἄλλως τε ἓνα Θεὸν νομίσαι μὴ δυνάμεθα εἶναι μὴ ὧντως Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ καὶ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι πιστεύσωμεν γινώσκων οὖν ὁ Πατρῷος Λόγος τὴν οἰκονομίαν καὶ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Πατρὸς, ὅτι οὐκ ἄλλως βουλέται δοξάζεσθαι ὁ Πατὴρ ἢ οὕτως, ἀναστὰς παρέδωκεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς λέγων, Πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα. κ. τ. λ. δεικνύων ὅτι πᾶς ὃς ἂν ἑν τούτων ἐκλίπῃ τελείως Θεὸν οὐκ ἐδόξασεν. Διὰ γὰρ τῆς Τριάδος ταύτης Πατὴρ δοξάζεται." —Hippol. Contra Noetum. c. xiv. p. 15.

² " Quia per individuitatem neque agnosci neque ignorari alter sine altero potest." —Tertull. Adv. Praxeam. c. xxii. p. 513.

We may now bring together the several results to which the present inquiry into "the Doctrine of Faith in the Holy Trinity" has led.

It has been shewn, First, that when God is described, in the Old Testament, or in the New, as the Creator, the Redeemer, or the Protector of Israel; he is described not as an Unipersonal God, but as a Triune God, *viz.*, as one God, in whose substance there are Three Persons, the Father—the Word, and the Spirit; that the Father, the Word, and the Spirit are Three Persons numerically distinct from each other, but are one God; the Three Persons subsisting in one undivided essence.

Secondly, That the Antenicene Fathers taught that the three Persons, the Father, the Son, and the Spirit, are consubstantial, co-equal, co-eternal; and that the substance of the Godhead is not of a specific but of a simple, uncompounded, indivisible nature; that the Persons, though equal in every essential perfection, have nevertheless rank and order; that, by reason of the economy of Persons, the Father is supreme, the Son is second in order, and the Holy Ghost is third in order.

Thirdly, That the doctrine of the Holy Trinity was taught as a fundamental doctrine in the creeds of the Antenicene Church; that sentence of excommunication was pronounced by the Antenicenes upon all persons who rejected or defiled that doctrine.

And that baptism was declared by the Ante-

nicenes to be deprived of its spiritual effect when recipients were supposed not to have been baptised into a consubstantial Trinity.

It may, with justice, therefore, be asserted, that the doctrine of the Trinity, which is set forth in the Articles and Creeds of the Established Church of England, is based upon the joint testimony of the Old and New Testaments; that it is the Catholic Faith of all ages, and has been always urged as a doctrine necessary to be believed in order to salvation.

What, then, the Scriptures contain, and the universal Church has always believed, let us also believe. Let us not inquire curiously *how* the Three Persons are one God, or *how* the one God is Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; but rather let us praise Him who has revealed to us the adorable mystery, that there is one God the Father who hath made us, one God the Son who hath redeemed us, and one God the Holy Ghost who sanctifieth us. Let us give thanks that we have been brought to this saving knowledge; and while we pray that God will vouchsafe to bring all men to this Faith, let us be mindful of the charge that was delivered by the Apostle, that we “keep this commandment without spot unrebukable, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ.”¹

¹ 1 Tim. vi. 14.

APPENDIX.

NOTE (a), page 17.

THE comparison of Haggai ii. 5, with Exod. xxix. 45, 46, which shews that it was the Spirit-Jehovah who conducted Israel into Canaan, enables us to understand the nature of the Angel who is mentioned in Exod. xxiii. 20, "Behold I send an Angel before thee to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared: beware of him and obey his voice; provoke him not; for he will not pardon your transgressions, for my Name is in him," &c. The Angel mentioned, is evidently, the Lord of Hosts, the Spirit.

After the idolatrous worship of the molten calf, God said, "I will send an Angel before thee; for *I will not go up in the midst of thee.*" Exod. xxxiii. 2, 3.

The Angel mentioned in this latter instance is supposed by many to be a *created* angel, opposed to "Jehovah-Angel," mentioned in the former instance. But this supposition, even if it could be borne out, will not affect the two points which I have endeavoured to prove, *i. e.*, that *the Spirit is the Angel* who guided Israel into Canaan, and that *the Angel is the Lord of Hosts*. For it is to be observed that God withdrew the threat which he made in chap. xxxiii. 3; and promised, in opposition to it, Exod. xxxiii. 14, that *He would go* with them, "My presence," says He, "shall go with thee," or, as the Septuagint has rendered it, *αὐτὸς προπορεύσομαι σοῦ*.

The guardianship of the Spirit is noticed by Isaiah, in the following words:—"They rebelled and vexed His Holy Spirit; therefore, He was turned to be their enemy,

and He fought against them. Then He remembered the days of old, Moses and his people, saying, where is He that brought them up out of the sea with the shepherd of his flock? Where is He that put His Holy Spirit within him? that led them by the right hand of Moses with His glorious arm, dividing the water before them, to make Himself an everlasting name? That led them through the deep as an horse in the wilderness, that they should not stumble? As a beast goeth down into the valley, the Spirit of the Lord caused him to rest." Isaiah lxiii. 10—14. The latter verse contains precisely what God promised above, in Exod. xxxiii. 14, "My presence shall go with thee; I will give thee rest." And it is to be observed also, that for חַנִּיכָהוּ, "caused him to rest," the Septuagint has ὠδήγησεν αὐτοῦς, "conducted them."

NOTE (β), page 19.

"Our Unitarians," says Stillingfleet, "pretend that they are satisfied that the form of baptism is found in all copies, and all the ancient translations; and that it was used before the Council of Nice, as appears by several places of Tertullian. But how then? There are two things objected by them."

"1st. That the Antenicene Fathers do not allege it to prove the Divinity of the Son or Holy Ghost."

"2nd. That the form of words here used doth not prove the Doctrine of the Trinity."—Vind. Trin. p. 177.

These being the only objections that can be raised against the text which I have quoted, I shall consider each of them separately.

In opposition to the first statement it is to be observed,

that it is erroneous to suppose "that the Antenicenes do not allege it to prove the Divinity of the Son or Holy Ghost." For the Prelate whose words I have just cited has made it the chief object of his ninth chapter, to ascertain from the writings of the Antenicenes, whether those Fathers did or did not allege the text to prove the Divinity of the Son and Holy Ghost; and he draws abundant proofs from their writings that they *did* allege it to prove the Divinity of the Son and Holy Ghost. He alludes to those proofs in p. 220, where, after the words, "They (*i. e.*, the Unitarians) say farther, that the ancients of the first four hundred years do not insist on this place, to prove the Divinity or Personality of the Son or Spirit;" he adds, "*As to the first three hundred years I have given an account already*; and, as to the fourth century, I could not have thought that they would have mentioned it; since there is scarce a Father of the Church, in that time, who had occasion to do it, but makes use of the argument from this place to prove the Divinity and Personality of the Son and Spirit."

With regard to the second objection, *viz.*, "That the form of words used by St. Matthew doth not prove the Doctrine of the Trinity." It is obvious that the case is otherwise. "To baptise is, in a general sense, to cleanse from defilement, and to set apart for a pure use; as an ordinance of the Christian religion to be received but once, it is symbolically to cleanse from the defilement of sin, and to consecrate by a perpetual obligation to a Christian life. This obligation is the most comprehensive which can be imposed: it involves faith, worship, and obedience; the devotion of body, and soul, and spirit; and it is incurred to the name not only of the Father, but of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. It is not worship towards one, obedience towards another, and faith towards another; nor is it all these in a different sense and degree towards each; nor yet is it all

these in the same sense towards one, through another, and in another. Our Saviour does not make any division, distribution, or gradation, of our baptismal engagements; neither does He distinguish one person as more especially, or in a higher degree, the object of those engagements, than another; but whatsoever things are undertaken in baptism, whatsoever duties a Godly and a Christian life comprehends, these, undivided and undistributed—these, in the same sense and degree, are intended. Such honour, the highest which man can give, belongs only to God; nor will He permit any creature to be associated with Him in it.”—Vogan, Bampton Lect. p. 165. Vide also Waterland’s Moyer’s Lectures, viii.; Randolph, Vind. Trinity, part ii. p. 54—61.

NOTE (γ), page 22.

“ We have the concurrent testimony of all ancient writers, both Jews and Christians, that *Jehovah* is the proper and incommunicable name of the Supreme God, and denotes an eternal, immutable, necessary existence. It is derived from the verb **הָיָה**, which signifies ‘to exist;’ and God himself has explained this to be the meaning of it. When Moses, Ex. iii. 13, desired to know of God *what was his name*, God said unto Moses **אֲנִי הָיָה אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי**—‘I am that I am,’ and then adds: ‘Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, *Jehovah*, the God of your Fathers, hath sent me unto you; this is my *name* for ever, and this is my *memorial* unto all generations.’ And to this doubtless our Lord referred, when he used that remarkable expression to the Jews,—‘Before Abraham was I am,’ John viii. 58. The Jews tell us that the time past, present, and to come, were all expressed in this word.

“ The Scriptures of truth in the most express terms appropriates this name to the true God. We have already seen that God, Exod. iii. 15, commanded Moses ‘ to say unto the children of Israel, Jehovah, the God of your Fathers, &c., hath sent me unto you : this is *my name* for ever, and this is *my memorial* unto all generations.’ And that this latter clause more particularly relates to the title Jehovah, appears by comparing it with the foregoing verse, and also with Hos. xii. 5 : ‘ Jehovah, the God of Hosts, Jehovah is his memorial.’ See also Ps. cxxxv. 13, which should be translated ‘ Jehovah is *thy name* for ever, Jehovah is *thy memorial* from generation to generation.’ ‘ I am Jehovah,’ saith God by his prophet, Isa. xlii. 8, ‘ that is *my name*, and *my glory* will I not give to another.’ Again, ‘ I am Jehovah (Isa. xlv. 5), and there is none else, there is no God besides me.’

“ ‘ Thou whose *name* alone is Jehovah,’ saith the Psalmist, lxxxii. 18, ‘ art the Most High over all the earth.’ This is called, Deut. xxviii. 58, ‘ the glorious and fearful name.’ This is the title on which God throughout the whole Old Testament insists ; by this He asserts His *Authority, Power,* and *Supremacy*, glorying, in a manner, and triumphing in it, as the distinguishing character by which he would be known to be infinitely superior to all the gods of the nations. With this title he introduces the Decalogue : ‘ I am Jehovah thy God,’ Ex. xx. 2, Levit. xviii. and xix., and elsewhere. And this he frequently adds by way of sanction to his laws, ‘ I am Jehovah.’

“ And thus he expresses himself to his Prophets, ‘ I, even I (Isa. xliii. 11), am Jehovah, and besides me there is no Saviour.’ ‘ I form (Isa. xlv. 7) the light, and create darkness ; I make peace, and create evil ; I Jehovah do all these things. “ Who hath (Isa. xlv. 26) declared this from ancient time : have not I Jehovah, and there is no God else

besides me.' 'Behold I am Jehovah (Jer. xxxii. 27), the God of all flesh: is there any thing too hard for me?' 'I am Jehovah (Mal. iii. 6); I change not.' 'All the Gods (Ps. xcvi. 5) of the nations are idols; but Jehovah made the Heavens.' 'Against all the Gods (Ex. xii. 12) of Egypt I will execute judgment: I am Jehovah.'"—Randolph's Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity, part i. p. 61—65.

NOTE (δ), page 27.

"As Christ is called an '*Advocate*,' so the Holy Ghost is said to be *another Advocate*. Christ our Advocate to plead our cause with God, He, Christ's Advocate, to plead His cause with the world:"—"The verb παρακαλεῖν is of a very large and unlimited signification: it sometimes signifies to 'comfort,' very frequently to 'preach,' 'teach,' and 'exhort,' and sometimes '*to plead as an Advocate the cause of another*.' And this seems to be the proper notion of the word παράκλητος in this place, '*the Advocate or Patron of a cause*,' one that pleads for the party accused. And in this sense, and no other, Christ is called our παράκλητος, or '*Advocate with the Father*.' 1 John ii. 1. 'If any man sin we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous.' And as *Christ is our Advocate* with the Father in Heaven, so *the Spirit is Christ's Advocate* here on earth, and pleads His cause with the world. And it is very observable that this very word '*Paraclete*,' though it be not an Hebrew, but a Greek word, is frequently used by the Chaldee paraphrast, and other Jewish writers, in this sense of an Advocate. And that this notion of the word agrees best with this place, I shall clearly shew, when I come to the second

head of my discourse; namely, to shew the happy consequence and effect of the coming of the Holy Ghost, viz., *the convincing of the world how injuriously they had dealt with Christ, and the clear vindication of his innocence, which is the proper office and work of an Advocate.*—Tillotson, vol. x. Serm. cxcviii. p. 308, 309. Vide also Clarke's Serm. vol. vi. p. 74.

NOTE (ε), page 37.

“But among all the reproaches,” observes Dr. Wall, “cast on the Fathers, there is none so scandalous and destructive of the credit both of the Fathers and of Christianity itself, as is one they have lately set abroad, viz., that the doctrine of the Trinity, or of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, in whom we believe, and in whose name we are baptised, is (as it is understood, explained, and held by the said Fathers) a doctrine of Tritheism, or of believing in three Gods. I may repeat their sayings, for they are industriously handed about in the English tongue. One of them says thus:—¹

“‘*They (the Fathers) thought the three hypostases (or persons in the Trinity) to be three equal Gods, as we should now express it.*’—And again:²—‘*Not to recur to the Fathers, whose opinion was quite different from that which is now received; and who, properly speaking, affirmed that there were three consubstantial Gods, as has been shewn by Petavius, Curcellæus, Cudworth, and others.*’

¹ M. Le Clerc, in his Supplement to Dr. Hammond's Annot. on 1 John v. 6, 4to. London, 1699.

² Ibid. Preface, or see the Latin edition, Novum Test. Hammondi et Clerici, 2 tom. fol. Francofurti. 1714, tom. ii. p. 594, sect. 5.

And again:—‘ *Who, to speak the truth, were Tritheists rather than asserters of the present opinion: for they believed the unity of substance, not the singularity of number, as Tertullian speaks; that is, that the substance of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost was specifically One, but numerically Three: as the learned men I before mentioned have clearly shewn, and might more largely be demonstrated.*’—Ibid.

“This slander on the writings of the Fathers our English Socinians greedily caught up; and to any thing that was offered out of the Fathers they have in their late books opposed this: that ‘*the Fathers held only a specific unity of the Divine nature, and the persons to be as so many individuals.*’¹

“This they repeat often, and refer to Curcellæus’ undeniable proofs of it. Of which Bishop Stillingfleet taking notice, did, in his Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity, answer and refute, particularly all the instances brought by Curcellæus in a large discourse, bringing, as he expresses it himself, ‘undeniable proofs’ that Curcellæus had mistaken their meaning.

“Notwithstanding this, what does the foresaid author do but three years after the publication of Stillingfleet’s book, writing some critical Epistles, loads them with the same slanders repeated, without taking any notice that they had been answered: saying, ‘*That the Nicene Fathers thought the Divine nature is no otherwise one than specifically, but that it is in number threefold; as Petavius, Curcellæus,*

¹ Defence of the Brief History of the Unitarians [against Dr. Sherlock’s Answer, 4to. Lond. 1691], p. 5. Answer to Lamoth [viz., Reflections on two Discourses concerning the Divinity of our Saviour, written by Monsieur Lamoth, in French, and done into English. Written to J. S. 4to. London, 1693, p. 24]. Letter to the University, p. 13.

*Cudworth, and others, have proved by such arguments as that there can nothing be said in answer to them.'*¹

“ In another of the said Epistles he repeats the same slander, and would father it on some learned men in England. He says, ‘ *Learned men in England, and elsewhere, do not forbear to say openly, that the Nicene Fathers believed three eternal and equal essences in God: and not one God in number.*’—Ibid. in Epist. 5. ad Episcop. Vigorn, p. 177.— And, having mentioned that several Protestant Churches have received the Nicene Creed into their public confessions, he adds:—‘ *If then they will stand to this part of their confession, they must own that they believe three eternal natures, and renounce the numerical unity of God. Or if they will not do that, they must expunge that Article of their confession in which they own the Nicene Faith.*’— Ibid. .

“ And these letters he ventures to send into England, directed to Bishops there, who he must needs think abominated such exorbitant sayings; and who could easily, if he had had the prudence to consult them first, have satisfied him that one of their brethren had long ago answered all those proofs of Curcellæus with which he made such a noise; Petavius’ and Cudworth’s instances being not so considerable, nor so maliciously urged.”—Wall’s Hist. Inf. Bapt. vol. ii. cap. v. § 8, 9. p. 147. Oxon. 1835.

NOTE (4), page 38.

I have preferred the phrase, “ The Holy Ghost is of the Father, and of the Son,” to that of the Nicene Creed, “ The

¹ Epist. iii., ad Episcop. Sarisb. p. 108. [See Jo. Clerici *Epistolæ Criticæ* (forming the third volume of his *Ars. Critica*), 12mo. Amstelodami. 1700.]

Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father and the Son," because it cannot, with strict propriety, be said that *all* the Fathers have admitted, "The Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father and the Son."

The *Latin* Fathers, it is certain, taught expressly the procession of the Spirit from the Father and the Son; "Spiritus quoque sanctus cum procedit a Patre et Filio, non separatur a Patre, non separatur a Filio."—S. Ambrose, de Spir. S. lib. i. c. 11. "Spiritus autem sanctus vere Spiritus est, procedens quidem a Patre et Filio: sed non est ipse Filius quia non generatur, neque Pater, quia procedit ab utroque."—*Id.* de Symbol. c. 3. "Non possumus dicere quod Spiritus Sanctus et a Filio non procedat: neque enim frustra Spiritus et Patris et Filii Spiritus dicitur."—Augustin, de Trin. lib. iv. c. 20. "Firmissime tene et nullatenus dubites eundem Spiritum Sanctum qui Patris et Filii unus est Spiritus, de Patre et Filio procedere."—Fulg. de Fide ad Petrum, c. 11.

But not so the *Greek* Fathers. The Greeks used the expression, "The Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father," but did not say, "He proceedeth from the Son." "Ἐπὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων ὄρων ἰστάμενοι, τὸ ἀγέννητον εἰσάγωμεν, καὶ τὸ γεννητὸν, καὶ τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον."—Greg. Nazianz. Orat. i. de Filio. But though the Greek Fathers did not use the expression, "He proceedeth from the Son," they used another precisely similar to it, *i. e.*, "He *received* of the Son;" and when they spoke of the Holy Ghost as "proceeding from the Father," they usually added, "He *received* of the Son," as may be seen from the following instances: "Καὶ γὰρ καὶ περὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος βλασφημοῦσι, καὶ τολμῶσι λέγειν κεκτίσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἄκτιστον ἐκ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ λαμβάνον."—Eriphan. Hær. lxi. § 52. "Τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, Πνεῦμα Θεοῦ, αἰεὶ ὄν σὺν Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ, οὐκ ἀλλότριον Θεοῦ, ἀπὸ

δὲ Θεοῦ ὄν, ἀπὸ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ λαμβάνον.”—*Id.* Ancor. § 6. “Ἀεὶ γὰρ τὸ Πνεῦμα σὺν Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ, οὐ συνάδελφον Πατρὶ, οὐ γεννητὸν, οὐ κτιστὸν, οὐκ ἀδελφὸν Υἱοῦ, οὐκ ἔγγονον Πατρὸς, ἐκ Πατρὸς δὲ ἐκπορευόμενον καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ λαμβάνον.”—*Id.* Hær. lxii. § 4.

The difference, therefore, which existed between the early Greek and Latin writers, was in words only, and not in sense. For, both agreed that the Holy Ghost receiveth his divine essence from the Father and the Son; only the Latins applied the term “*proceeding*,” indiscriminately to the Father and the Son; whereas the Greeks restricted it to the Father, and applied the Scriptural term “*received*,” to denote the procession from the Son.

In later years, when schismatics arose in the Eastern Church, and denied that the Spirit receiveth His essence from the Son as well as from the Father, the Latins inserted the words “*Filioque*” into the Constantinopolitan Creed; and the clause, which formerly ran in the words “*a Patre procedens*,” was accordingly expanded to that of “*a Patre Filioque procedens*,” as we now read it in the Nicene Creed. But the insertion of the words, “*Filioque*” was attended with a lamentable result, for it occasioned the vast schism between the Churches of the East and the West, which exists to the present day. Neither Church can be excused for the part which it took in this transaction. The Latins ought not to have added to the form of creed which had been resolved upon by the second council at Constantinople; for they were expressly forbidden to do so by a general council held at Ephesus; nor ought they to have insisted that the Greeks should receive into the Creed an expression which, as I before remarked, was not to be found in any of the writings of the early Greek Fathers; and the Greeks, on the other hand, are equally inexcusable for having deviated so far from the early Catholic doctrine of the East

and West as to render it necessary that the Latins should have resorted to the unhappy expedient to which they did.

NOTE (η), page 38.

Sherlock makes the same observation, in his "Commentary on the Athanasian Creed." Having quoted the words, "*And in this Trinity, none is afore or after other, none is greater or less than another, but the whole Three Persons are co-eternal and co-equal,*" he writes, "And yet this we must acknowledge to be true, if we acknowledge all Three Persons to be Eternal, for in Eternity there can be no *afore or after other*. And that we cannot conceive an Eternal generation or procession is no great wonder, when we cannot conceive an Eternal Being, without any beginning or any cause.

"As for greater or less, and the equality of Three Persons, this we must confess also, if we believe all Three Persons to be one Supreme and Sovereign God; for in one Supreme Deity there cannot be greater or less; but then we must distinguish between *subordination* and *equality*. Persons who are *equal* may be *subordinate* to each other; and though there be not a greater or less, yet there is order in the Trinity. Equality is owing to nature, subordination to relation and order, which is indeed a greater and less in relation and order without an inequality of nature; *and it is the equality of Persons with respect to their nature, not to their order and subordination, of which the Creed speaks*; for in this sense the Father is greater than the Son, and the Father and the Son than the Holy Spirit, as being first in order, but their nature is the same, and their Persons, with respect to this same nature, co-equal."—Sherlock's Vind. Trinity, p. 18.

NOTE (θ), page 47.

“ There are reasons for thinking, that Theodotus by no means went so far as to maintain what is now called the simple humanity of Christ; and I cannot help quoting a remarkable passage in Athanasius, which shews that, in his opinion at least, such a notion had never been entertained.

“ Athanasius is stating that the Arians had been condemned for saying, that Christ was created, and that there was a time when He did not exist:—*‘ But if any one (he says) should wish to expose them by a still stronger argument, he will find that this heresy is not perhaps far removed from heathen notions; but that, with respect to other heresies, it goes much further, and is the very dregs of them. For the error of those heresies has been either concerning the Lord’s Body, and His union with man, some inventing this falsehood, and some that, or in saying that the Lord had not been on earth at all, which is the error into which the Jews were led: but the Arian heresy is the only one which, with still greater madness, has attacked the Divinity itself, and said that the LOGOS had no existence at all, and that the Father was not alway a Father.’* Athanasius says plainly in this passage, that the Arians went further than any other heretics in denying the Divinity of Christ. The distinctive mark of Arianism was this: it was maintained that there was a time when Christ did not exist, and that there was a time when he was called into being by God. It was observed with truth, by Athanasius and the Fathers, that this was to say in other words that Christ was created; but still the Arians maintained, in their own sense, that Christ was God; they did not refuse to speak of him as *very God of very God*; and it would be preposterous to say, that men who spoke thus of Christ went further in denying his Divinity than those who said he was a mere man, without any inherent divinity at all. It follows,

therefore, that Athanasius could never have heard of persons having maintained the latter notion ; and, when he describes the preceding heresies, he says expressly, that they related to the Lord's Body and his union with man. These words evidently refer to the Gnostics, whether Docetæ or Ebionites ; and Athanasius says, that they did not lower the Divinity of Christ so much as the Arians. There may be something of polemical hyperbole in this statement ; and his comparison of the Arians and Gnostics would not perhaps bear a strict examination : but this much may at least be concluded, that Athanasius knew of no persons, since the first rise of Christianity, who had lowered the Divinity of Christ so much as the Arians ; and I have shewn that it was JESUS and not CHRIST, whose divinity the Gnostics denied ; but all of them believed CHRIST to have pre-existed, to have proceeded forth from God, and to have been united for a time to a real or apparent human body.

“ We still, therefore, are without any evidence of the proper Unitarian doctrines being held in the three first centuries. Theodotus may have been overlooked by Athanasius ; or, which appears not improbable, though he believed Christ to be a mere man, he held that something divine resided in Him.”—Burton's Bampton Lect. p. 248.

NOTE (c), page 52.

“ Formulam illam confessionis Catholicæ de SS. Trinitate a Gregorio revera profectam fuisse constat. Nam eidem illam tribuit non modo Ruffinus,¹ sed et ipsius, cognominis Gregorius² Nyssenus, qui viri admirabilis res gestas ; et

¹ Hist. Eccl. lib. vii. c. 25.

² In Vita. S. Greg. Thaum. Oper. tom. ii. p. 978, 979.

scripta accurate perspecta habuit, adeoque vitam ejus descripsit. Quin et rem hanc ita narrat vir eximius, ut vix quisquam cordatus de ea dubitare possit. Nimiorum confessionem illam recitaturus, hæc verba præmittit; Δι' ἧς μυσταγωγεῖται μέχρι τοῦ νῦν ὁ ἐκείνης λαὸς, πάσης αἰρετικῆς κακίας διαμείνας ἀπείρατος, i. e. '*Per quam (Confessionem) usque in præsentem diem instituitur plebs illa (nempe Neo-Cæsarensis) quæ ab omni hæretica malitia intacta permansit.*' Scilicet adeo certum erat, confessionem illam fidei a Gregorio Thaumaturgo profectam, ut plebs omnis civitatis Neo-Cæsarensis, cujus Episcopus et immortale decus ille fuit, illam, ut Gregorii indubie genuinam, amplexa perque ipsam, a Patrum memoria usque ad Nysseni ætatem, institui solita fuerit: indeque factum, ut Ecclesia Neo-Cæsarensis, cum totus mundus Arianus fierit, ab hæretica malitia se illæsam conservaverit. Postquam vero Confessionem recitasset Nyssenus, hæc subjungit: ὅτω δὲ φίλον περὶ τούτου πεισθῆναι ἀκουέτω τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἐν ᾗ τὸν λόγον ἐκήρυττεν, παρ' οἷς αὐτὰ τὰ χαράγματα τῆς μακαρίας ἐκείνης χειρὸς εἰς ἔστι καὶ νῦν διασώζεται, i. e., '*quod si quis sibi fidem de hac re fieri cupit, audiat Ecclesiam, in qua sermonem prædica- bat, apud quam illa ipsa verba a beata illa manu exarata, adhuc etiam nunc conservantur.*' Apellat ipsum Thaumaturgi αὐτόγραφον, a Neo-Cæsarensibus usque ad suam ætatem religiose custoditum. Nescio sane an ad ejusmodi traditionem aliquam confirmandam quicquam amplius desiderari possit. Cæterum Gregorii Nysseni testimonio aperte suffragari mihi videtur Basilii Magni ipsius frater, qui Epist. 75, ad Neo-Cæsarenses testatur, se ab avia sua, in tenera ætate, Gregorii Thaumaturgi ipsa verba dedicisse, quibus recte de fide in SS. Trinitatem institutus fuerit. Verba ejus sunt: ¹ Πίστεως δὲ τῆς ἡμετέρας τίς ἂν γένοιτο ἐναργε-

¹ Basil. Oper. tom. iii. p. 131. Edit. 1638. [Ep. cciv. 6. vol. iii. p. 306.]

στέρα ἀπόδειξις, ἥ ὅτι τραφέντες ἡμεῖς ὑπὸ τίτθῃ μακαρίᾳ γυναικί, παρ' ὑμῶν ὠρμημένη; Μακρίναν λέγω τὴν περιβόητον· παρ' ἧς ἐδιδάχθημεν τὰ τοῦ μακαριωτάτου Γρηγορίου ῥήματα, ὅσα πρὸς αὐτὴν ἀκολουθία μνήμης διασωθέντα αὐτὴ τε ἐφύλασσε, καὶ ἡμᾶς ἔτι νηπίους ὄντας ἔπλαττε καὶ ἐμόρφου τοῖς τῆς εὐσεβείας δόγμασι· i. e., ‘*Fidei vero nostræ quæ poterit esse evidentior probatio, quam quod a nutrice beata fœmina, quæ ex vestro gremio progressa est (Macrinam dico illustrem illam) educati sumus? a qua et beatissimi Gregorii verba dedicimus, quæ memoriæ beneficio ad illius usque ætatem conservata, et ipsa retinuit, et nos adhuc infantes iisdem, tanquam pietatis dogmatibus formavit.*’ Omnino, inquam, hic Thaumaturgi confessio designari mihi videtur. Nam totidem verbis a Gregorio traditam fidei ὑποτύπωσιν de SS. Trinitate (quippe de ea ibi agit) se in infantia sua, ab avia Macrina Neo-Cæsareensi edoctum fuisse diserte testatur Basilius.

“ Attende lector. Nyssenus refert, Populum Neo-Cæsareensem per Thaumaturgi confessionem, a Patrum memoria ad suam usque ætatem institui solitum fuisse; ait vero Basilius, se ab avia sua, (nempe dum apud ipsam Neo-Cæsareæ in Ponto una cum parentibus suis vitam ageret,) in tenera ætate (hoc est, ante Concilium Nicænum,) rectam fidem de SS. Trinitate, totidem Gregorii verbis conceptam, edidicisse. Quis non existimaverit de eadem fidei confessione utrumque loqui? Quin et idem Basilius, lib. de Spiritu S. cap. 29, testatur, tantam fuisse Gregorii illius apud Neo-Cæsareenses usque ad sua tempora existimationem, ut nihil sive in doctrina, sive in ritibus admittere in Ecclesia voluerint, nisi quod a maximo illo fundatore suo traditum accepissent. Verba Basilii hæc sunt: ¹ τούτου μέγα ἔτι καὶ νῦν τοῖς ἐγχωρίοις τὸ θαῦμα, καὶ νεαρὰ καὶ αἰὲν πρόσφατος ἡ μνήμη ταῖς ἐκκλη-

¹ Basil. Oper. tom. iii. p. 360. Edit. Paris, 1638. [Vol. iii. p. 63.]

σίαις ἐνίδρυται, οὐδενὶ χρόνῳ ἀμαυρουμένη· οὐκοῦν οὐ πρᾶξιν τινα, οὐ λόγον, οὐ τύπον τινὰ μυστικόν, παρ' ὃν ἐκεῖνος κατέλειπε, τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ προσέθηκαν· i. e., ‘ *Hujus (Gregorii) in hodiernum quoque diem magna est apud ejus regionis homines admiratio, recensque ac semper vicens memoria sic infixæ est Ecclesiis, ut nullo tempore obscuretur. Itaque non praxin aliquam, non dictum, non formam ullam mysticam ultra quam ille reliquit, Ecclesiæ (suæ) adjecerunt.*’ Si dictum nullum, ultra quam illis reliquit Gregorius, certe multo minus Symbolum aliquod aut Fidei confessionem, quam ab ipso non acceperat, Ecclesia Neo-Cæsareensis voluit admittere: et tamen Basilii ætate confessionem fidei, qua de agimus, in Ecclesia ista receptam fuisse, idque ut a Gregorio traditam, certissimum est. His addas, quod confessio illa tradatur, ut Thaumaturgi indubie genuina, a Patribus universis, in quinta Synodo œcumenica congregatis. Denique ipsa confessio ætatem Gregorii Thaumaturgi plane redolet: quippe quæ manifeste opposita sit hæresibus, quæ ecclesiam Christi tum temporis maxime turbarunt. Duæ imprimis iis temporibus hæreses vigeabant, ut ex epistola Dionysii Romani apud Athanasium supra commemorata liquet: altera Sabellii, quæ Patrem, Filium, et Spiritum S. nomine solum, non ὑποστάσει differre statuebat: altera Sabellianæ velut ex diametro contraria, eorum nempe, qui SS. Trinitatem dividebant in tres hypostases separatas, peregrinas, atque a se invicem alienas, quique adeo dicebant, Filium et Spiritum S., creaturas esse, et aliquando Deo Patri defuisse. Priorem hæresim aperte feriunt verba ista in ipso confessionis initio: πατὴρ λόγου ζῶντος σοφίας ὑφειστώσης· et illa: υἱὸς ἀληθινὸς, ἀληθινοῦ πατρὸς· Nam Sabellius neque verum Patrem, neque verum Filium, sed utrumque nomine tantum fatebatur; ac denique illa de Spiritu Sancto: ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν ὑπαρξιν ἔχον. Hæresim alteram, præter alia, prorsus jugulant verba illa: τριάς τελεία, δόξη καὶ αἰδιότητι καὶ βασιλείᾳ μὴ μεριζομένη μηδ' ἀπαλλοτριουμένη, et sequentia: οὔτε οὖν

κτιστόν τι, ἡ δούλον ἐν τῇ Τριάδι. κ. τ. λ. Ut verbo dicam, conferat Lector Studiosus professionem Dionysii Romani de Sancta Trinitate. quam capite superiori, n. 1, ex Athanasio recitavimus, cum hac Gregorii nostri, ejus co-æetanei confessione; et miram utriusque convenientiam illico perspiciet.

“ § 3. Quid jam ad hæc Sandius? *De confessione fidei*, inquit, *nihil aliud dico, quam de ea tacere Eusebium et Hieronymum et Sophronium.*¹ Quasi Scilicet Eusebius et Hieronymus omnia veterum Patrum Scripta et facta commemoraverint. Certe Eusebius in Historia sua Ecclesiastica, nescio quo casu (nam ut credam malo aliquo consilio id factum, quod putavit Anastasius Bibliothecarius, a me impetrare nequeo,) Gregorii Thaumaturgi laudes fere silentio pressit, nec quicquam de miraculis ejus, per totum Christianum orbem celebratis, dicit. Puto in alio aliquo opere, quod intercidit, plura de Gregorio Thaumaturgo retulisse Eusebium.

Certe in Apologia pro Origene,² ejus discipuli Gregorii Thaumaturgi mentionem facit, inserta etiam ei operi Panegyrica ejusdem oratione in laudem Origenis, ut testatur Socrates. H. E. l. iv. c. 27. Eusebii autem historiam fere κατὰ πόδας secutus est Hieronymus: Sophronius vero tantum Hieronymi interpretes fuit. Miror autem quid Philippo Labbæo in mentem venerit, dum in dissertatione sua de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis ita scripsit: *Certum quidem, inquit, est, teste S. Gregorio Nysseno in Thaumaturgi vita, Deiparam cum S. Joanne Evangelista apparuisse, ut expositionem fidei Catholicæ illi traderet. Sed an ea sit Vossiana, jure dubitat Bellarminus, quem vide cum Petavio, tom. ii. Theolog. Dogmat. qui negat.*³ Nam an fidei confessio a Vossio edita, Gregorii Thaumaturgi revera sit, nunquam dubitavit Bellarminus; imo illud pro certo habuit, ut

¹ De Script. Eccl. p. 39.

² i. e., Apologia Pamphili et Eusebii.

³ [Vol. i. p. 373.]

cuivis ipsum Bellarminum consulenti patebit. De ἐκθέσει sive expositione fidei longiori, quæ κατὰ μέρος dicitur, ab eodem Vossio edita, dubitat quidem Bellarminus, et jure merito. Falsum quoque est Petavium negasse, confessionem illam, prout a Vossio edita est, Gregorii esse genuinam. Imo illam citat ut Gregorii, et *illustre monumentum traditionis Ecclesiasticæ, ac Catholicæ de Trinitate professionis*, disserte appellat."—Prefat. in tom. ii. cap. iv. n. 5. Bull. Defens. Fid. Nicæn. sect. ii. cap. xii. § 2, 3.

"Gregorii honorificam mentionem tribus in locis Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ fecit Eusebius. Nam vi. 30. De discipulis Origenis ait Ὡν ἐπισήμους μάλιστα ἔγνωμεν, Θεόδωρον, ὃς ἦν αὐτὸς οὗτος, ὁ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἐπισκόπων διαβόητος Γρηγόριος τὸν τε αὐτοῦ ἀδελφὸν Ἀθηνόδωρον. Quorum præcipuos fuisse cognovimus Theodorum, qui et Gregorius dictus est, episcoporum nostra ætate celeberrimus: et fratrem ejus Athenodorum. Et vii. 14. ac. 28. Eum inter præcipuos istius ævi Episcopos numerat: sed nulla illius opera, vel libros ab ipso scriptos nominat. Nominavit autem, ut hunc defectum suppleret, ultimo loco Ruffinus vii. 26. Hist. Eccl. (juxta ejus divisionem) ubi hæc legimus. 'Verum quoniam beati Gregorii Historiæ textus attulit mentionem, dignissimum puto, tanti viri gesta, quæ sub orientali et septentrionis axe cunctorum sermone celebrantur, omissa, nescio quo casu, huic narrationi ad memoriam posteritatis inserere.' Unde post narrata aliqua ejus miracula, de scriptis ejus sequentia subdit. 'Sed et ingenii sui nobis in parvo maxima monumenta dereliquit. In Ecclesiastem namque metaphrasin idem Gregorius magnificentissime scripsit. Et Catholicæ fidei expositionem breviter editam dereliquit: quam quo ædificatione Ecclesiarum sociare his commodo duxi.' Hinc ipsa Gregorii confessio sequitur, prout in hoc capite, supra p. 151. [p. 416.] recitata est."—Annotata. J. E. Grabe. ad § 4. Defens. Fid. Nicæn. de Gregorii Thaumaturgi Confessione Fidei.

The Creed of Gregory Thaumaturgus.

There is one God, the Father of the living Word, the subsisting wisdom, and power, and eternal impress: he is the perfect begetter of the Perfect One, even the Father of the only-begotten Son. There is one Lord, the alone from the alone, God from God, the express impress and image of the Godhead, the energetic Word, the wisdom comprehending the constitution of all things, and the plastic power of the whole creation: the true son of the true Father, the invisible of the invisible, the incorruptible of the incorruptible, the immortal of the immortal, the eternal of the eternal. And there is one Holy Ghost, having his subsistence from God, who appeared unto men through the Son, the image of the Son, perfect of perfect; life, the cause of the living; the holy fountain, holiness, the bestower of sanctification: in whom God the Father is manifested who is over all, and in all, and God the Son who is through all. A perfect Trinity, in glory, and eternity, and kingdom, neither divided nor separated. There is therefore nothing created, or servile, in this Trinity, or adventitious, as if it existed not before, but was afterwards introduced: for the Son was never wanting to the Father, nor the Spirit to the Son. But this Trinity is eternally the same, unchangeable and invariable.

Symbolum Gregorii Thaumaturgi.

“Εἷς Θεὸς, Πατὴρ Λόγου ζῶντος, Σοφίας ὑφεστώσης, καὶ Δυνάμεως, καὶ Χαρακτῆρος αἰδίου τέλειος τελείου γεννήτωρ Πατὴρ Υἱοῦ μονογενοῦς. Εἷς Κύριος, μόνος ἐκ μόνου, Θεὸς ἐκ Θεοῦ· χαρακτὴρ καὶ εἰκὼν τῆς Θεότητος, Λόγος ἐνεργὸς, Σοφία τῆς τῶν ὄλων συστάσεως περιεκτικῇ, καὶ Δύναμις τῆς ὄλης κτίσεως ποιητικῇ· Υἱὸς ἀληθινὸς ἀληθινοῦ Πατρὸς, ἀόρατος ἀοράτου, καὶ ἀφθαρτος ἀφθάρτου, καὶ ἀθάνατος ἀθανάτου, καὶ αἰδῖος αἰδίου. Καὶ ἐν Πνεῦμα Ἁγίον, ἐκ Θεοῦ τὴν ὑπαρξιν ἔχον, καὶ δι’ Υἱοῦ πεφηνὸς δηλαδὴ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, εἰκὼν τοῦ Υἱοῦ, τελείου τελεία· ζωὴ, ζώντων αἰτία· πηγὴ ἁγία, ἁγιότης, ἁγιασμοῦ χορηγός· ἐν ᾧ φανεροῦται Θεὸς ὁ Πατὴρ ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων καὶ ἐν πᾶσι, καὶ Θεὸς ὁ Υἱὸς ὁ διὰ πάντων· Τριάς τελεία, δόξα καὶ αἰδιότητι καὶ βασιλεία μὴ μεριζομένη μηδὲ ἀπαλλοτριούμενη. Οὔτε οὖν κτιστόν τι, ἢ δοῦλον ἐν τῇ Τριάδι, οὔτε ἐπεισακτόν τι, ὡς πρότερον μὲν οὐχ ὑπάρχον, ὕστερον δὲ ἐπεισελθόν. Οὔτε οὖν ἐνέλιπε πότε Υἱὸς Πατρί, οὔτε Υἱὸς Πνεῦμα· ἀλλ’ ἀτρεπτος καὶ ἀναλλοίωτος ἡ αὐτὴ Τριάς αἰεί.”

—Gregor. Neo-Cæsar. Oper. p. 1. et ap. Greg. Nyss. tom. iii. p. 546.

The Creed of Origen.

The things which are manifestly handed down by the Apostolical preaching are these:—First, that there is one God, who created and made all things, and caused the whole universe to exist out of nothing: the God of all the just from the first creation and foundation of all; the God of Adam, Abel, Seth, Enos, Enoch, Noe, Sem, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, the twelve Patriarchs, Moses, and the Prophets: and that this God in the last days, as he had promised before by his prophets, sent our Lord Jesus Christ, first to call Israel and then the Gentiles, after the infidelity of his people Israel. This just and good God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, gave both the Law and the Prophets, and the Gospels, being the God of the Apostles and of the Old and New Testament.

The next Article is:—That Jesus Christ, who came into the world, was begotten of the Father before every creature, who ministering to his Father in the creation of all things (for by him all things were made), in the last times made himself of no reputation and became man: he who was God was made flesh, and when he was man he continued the same God that he was before. He assumed a body in all things like ours, save only that it was born of a virgin by the Holy Ghost. And because this Jesus Christ was born and suffered death common to all, in truth, and not only in appearance, he was truly dead: for he rose again truly from the dead, and after his resurrection conversed with his disciples, and was taken up into heaven. They also delivered unto us, that the Holy Ghost was joined in the same honour and dignity with the Father and the Son.

Symbolum Origenis.

“Species vere eorum, quæ per prædicationem apostolicam manifeste traduntur, istæ sunt. Primo, quod unus Deus est, qui omnia creavit atque composuit, quique ex nullis fecit esse universa: Deus a prima creatura et conditione mundi omnium justorum, Deus Adam, Abel, Seth, Enos, Enoch, Noe, Sem, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, duodecim Patriarcharum, Moysi, et Prophetarum. Et quod hic Deus in novissimis diebus, sicut per prophetas suos ante promiserat, misit Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, primo quidem vocaturum Israel, secundo etiam Gentes post perfidiam populi Israel. Hic Deus justus et bonus, Pater Domini nostri Jesu Christi, Legem et Prophetas et Evangelia dedit, qui et Apostolorum Deus est, et Veteris et Novi Testamenti.

“Tum deinde—Quia Jesus Christus ipse qui venit, ante omnem creaturam natus ex Patre est: qui cum in omnium conditione Patri ministrasset (per ipsum enim omnia facta sunt) novissimis temporibus seipsum exinaniens homo factus est: incarnatus est cum Deus esset, et homo mansit quod Deus erat. Corpus assumpsit nostro corpori simile, eo solo differens quod natum ex Virgine de Spiritu Sancto est. Et quoniam hic Jesus Christus natus, et passus est in veritate et non per imaginem communem hanc mortem, vere mortuus est; vere enim a mortuis resurrexit, et post resurrectionem conversatus cum discipulis suis, assumptus est.

“Tum deinde honore ac dignitate Patri et Filio sociatum tradiderunt Spiritum Sanctum.”—Origen. *Περὶ ἀρχῶν* in Præfat. tom. i. p. 665. Interprete Ruffino.

The Creed of Lucian Martyr.

We believe, according to the evangelical and apostolical tradition, in one God, Father Almighty, the Creator and Maker of all things. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, His only-begotten Son, God, by whom all things were made : who was begotten of the Father before all worlds, God of God, whole of whole, alone of alone, perfect of perfect, King of King, Lord of Lord, the living Word, Wisdom, Life, true Light, the Way of Truth, the Resurrection, Shepherd, Door, unchangeable and unalterable : the unvarying image of the Divinity, substance and power and counsel and glory of the Father : begotten before every creature : who was at the beginning with God, the Word God, according to what is said in the Gospel, " And the Word was God, by whom all things were made, and in whom all things subsist : " who in the latter days came down from above, and was born of a virgin according to the Scriptures : and was made man, a Mediator between God and men, the Apostle of our faith, the Prince of life, as he says, " I came down from heaven, not that I might do my own will, but the will of Him that sent me : " who suffered for us, and rose again for us on the third day, and ascended into heaven, and sat down on the right hand of the Father, and cometh again with glory and power to judge quick and dead. And in the Holy Ghost, which was given for consolation and satisfaction, and for the perfecting of them that believe : as also our Lord Jesus Christ charged his disciples, saying, " Go ye and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost ; evidently of the Father who is truly Father, and of the Son who is truly Son, and of the Holy Ghost who is truly Holy Ghost : the names not being merely given, or without reality, but signifying strictly the proper person and glory and office of each of those who are named ; so that they are three in person, but one in agreement.

Symbolum Luciani Martyris.

“ Πιστεύομεν ἀκολουθῶς τῇ εὐαγγελικῇ καὶ Ἀποστολικῇ παραδόσει, εἰς ἓνα Θεὸν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα, τὸν τῶν ὅλων δημιουργόν τε καὶ ποιητήν· καὶ εἰς ἓνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, Θεὸν, δι’ οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο· τὸν γεννηθέντα πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς, Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ, ὅλον ἐξ ὅλου, μόνον ἐκ μόνου, τέλειον ἐκ τελείου, βασιλέα ἐκ βασιλέως, Κύριον ἀπὸ Κυρίου· Λόγον ζῶντα, Σοφίαν, ζωὴν, φῶς ἀληθινόν, ὁδὸν ἀληθείας, ἀνάστασιν, ποιημένα, θύραν, ἄτρεπτόν τε καὶ ἀναλλοίωτον· τὴν τῆς Θεότητος, οὐσίας τε καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ βουλῆς καὶ δόξης τοῦ Πατρὸς ἀπαράλλακτον εἰκόνα· τὸν πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως· τὸν ὄντα ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, Λόγον Θεόν, κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον, ἐκ τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ, καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος, δι’ οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, καὶ ἐν ᾧ τὰ πάντα συνέστηκε· τὸν ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν κατελθόντα ἄνωθεν, καὶ γεννηθέντα ἐκ παρθένου κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς, καὶ ἄνθρωπον γενόμενον, μεσίτην Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, Ἀπόστολόν τε τῆς πίστεως ἡμῶν, καὶ ἀρχηγὸν τῆς ζωῆς, ὥς φήσιν. ὅτι καταβέβηκα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, οὐχ ἵνα ποιῶ τὸ θέλημα τὸ ἐμὸν, ἀλλὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με· τὸν παθόντα ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, καὶ ἀναστάντα ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς οὐρανοῦς, καὶ καθεσθέντα ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ πάλιν ἐρχόμενον μετὰ δόξης καὶ δυνάμεως κρίναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς· καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, τὸ εἰς παράκλησιν καὶ ἁγιασμόν καὶ εἰς τελείωσιν τοῖς πιστεύουσι διδόμενον, καθὼς καὶ ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς διετάξατο τοῖς μαθηταῖς, λέγων, Πορευθέντες οὖν μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ Ἀγίου Πνεύματος· δῆλον ὅτι Πατὴρ ἀληθινῶς ὄντος Πατρὸς, καὶ Υἱοῦ ἀληθινῶς υἱοῦ ὄντος, καὶ Πνεύματος Ἀγίου ἀληθινῶς ὄντος Πνεύματος ἁγίου· τῶν ὀνομάτων οὐχ ἀπλῶς οὐδὲ ἀργῶν κειμένων, ἀλλὰ σημαινόντων ἀκριβῶς τὴν ἰδίαν ἐκάστου τῶν ὀνομαζομένων ὑπόστασιν τε καὶ δόξαν καὶ τάξιν, ὡς εἶναι τῇ μὲν ὑποστάσει τρία, τῇ δὲ συμφωνίᾳ ἓν.”—

Socrat. Hist. Eccl. lib. ii. 10. Athanas. de Synod. Arim. et Seleuc. § 23. vol. i. p. 735.

*The Creed,
Into which Eusebius of Cæsarea was Baptised.*

We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of all things visible and invisible. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Word of God, God of God, Light of Light, Life of Life, His only-begotten Son, the first-born of every creature, begotten of the Father before all ages; by whom all things were made; who, for our salvation, was incarnate, and conversed among men, and suffered, and rose again the third day, and ascended unto the Father, and shall come again to judge the quick and the dead. We believe also in one Holy Spirit. Every one of these we believe to be and exist; we confess the Father to be truly a Father, the Son truly a Son, the Holy Ghost truly a Holy Ghost, according to what our Lord, when He sent His disciples to preach, said, "Go, teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

*Symbolum Fidei,
In quod Eusebius Cæsariensis Baptizatus erat.*

“ Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἓνα Θεόν, Πατέρα παντοκράτορα, τὸν τῶν ἀπάντων ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀοράτων ποιητὴν· καὶ εἰς ἓνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγον, Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ, φῶς ἐκ φωτός, ζωὴν ἐκ ζωῆς, Υἱὸν μονογενῆ, πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως, πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ Πατρὸς γεγεννημένον· δι’ οὗ καὶ ἐγένετο τὰ πάντα· τὸν διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν σαρκωθέντα, καὶ ἐν ἀνθρώποις πολιτευσάμενον· καὶ παθόντα, καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ· καὶ ἀνελθόντα πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα, καὶ ἥξοντα πάλιν ἐν δόξῃ κρίναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς. Πιστεύομεν καὶ εἰς ἓν Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον. τούτων ἕκαστον εἶναι καὶ ὑπάρχειν πιστεύοντες, Πατέρα ἀληθῶς Πατέρα, καὶ Υἱὸν ἀληθῶς Υἱὸν, καὶ Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον ἀληθῶς Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα· καθὼς καὶ Κύριος ἡμῶν ἀποστέλλων εἰς τὸ κήρυγμα τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ μαθητάς, εἶπε, Πορευθέντες οὖν μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος.” — Socrat. Hist. Eccl. lib. i.—viii.

*The Creed,**As it occurs in the Apostolical Constitutions.*

I believe, and I am baptised into the one unbegotten alone true Almighty God, the Father of the Christ, the Maker and Creator of all things, from whom are all things. And into the Lord Jesus Christ, His only-begotten Son, the first-born of every creature, who before all ages was begotten, through the good pleasure of the Father, through whom all things were made, both in Heaven and on earth, both visible and invisible; who came down from Heaven, in the last days, and assumed flesh, and was born from the Holy Virgin Mary, and lived holily after the laws of His God and Father, and was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and died for us; and, after His passion, rose again from the dead on the third day, and ascended to Heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of the Father; and will come again with glory at the end of the world to judge the quick and the dead, of whose kingdom there shall be no end. And I am baptised into the Holy Ghost, that is, the Paraclete, who worketh in all the Saints, from the beginning of the world; but who was afterward sent also to the Apostles from the Father, according to the promise of our Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ; and, after the Apostles, to all who believe in the Holy Catholic Church. And I am baptised into the resurrection of the flesh, and the forgiveness of sins, and the kingdom of Heaven, and the life of the world to come.

*Symbolum Fidei,
Ex Apostolicis Constitutionibus excerptum.*

“ Βαπτίζομαι εἰς ἓνα ἀγέννητον μόνον ἀληθινὸν Θεὸν παντοκράτορα, τὸν Πατέρα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, κτίστην καὶ δημιουργὸν τῶν ἀπάντων, ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ εἰς τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν τὸν Χριστὸν, τὸν μονογενῆ αὐτοῦ Υἱὸν, τὸν πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως, τὸν πρὸ αἰώνων εὐδοκίᾳ τοῦ Πατρὸς γεννηθέντα, δι’ οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο τὰ ἐν οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς, ὁρατά τε καὶ ἀόρατα, τὸν ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων ἡμερῶν κατελθόντα ἐξ οὐρανῶν, καὶ σάρκα ἀναλαβόντα, καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας παρθένου Μαρίας γεννηθέντα, καὶ πολιτευσάμενον ὁσίως μετὰ τοὺς νόμους τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ σταυρωθέντα ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, καὶ ἀποθανόντα ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, καὶ ἀναστάντα ἐκ νεκρῶν μετὰ τὸ παθεῖν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, καὶ καθεσθέντα ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ πάλιν ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τοῦ αἰῶνος μετὰ δόξης κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκροὺς, οὗ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος. Βαπτίζομαι καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον, τουτέστι τὸν Παράκλητον, τὸ ἐνεργῆσαν ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἀπ’ αἰῶνος ἁγίοις, ὕστερον δὲ ἀποσταλὲν καὶ τοῖς ἀποστόλοις παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς κατὰ τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ μετὰ τοὺς ἀποστόλους δὲ πᾶσι τοῖς πιστεύουσιν, ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, εἰς σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν, καὶ εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτῶν, καὶ εἰς βασιλείαν οὐρανῶν, καὶ εἰς ζωὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος.”—Constit. Apostol. lib. vii. c. 41. Patr. Apost. Cotel. vol. i. p. 383.

*The Nicene Creed, as first published by the Council of
Nice.*

We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of all things, both visible and invisible. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father, *the only-begotten*, THAT IS, *of the substance of the Father*; God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God; begotten, not made, of the same substance with the Father; by whom all things were made that are in Heaven and that are in earth; who, for us men, and for our salvation, descended, and was incarnate, was made man, suffered, and rose again the third day: He ascended into Heaven: He shall come to judge the quick and the dead. [We also believe] in the Holy Ghost. But those who say that there was a time when He was not, or that He was not before He was begotten, or that He was made of nothing; and those who affirm that He is of any other substance or essence; or that the Son of God is created, or convertible, or obnoxious to change; [all such] God's Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church doth anathematize.

Symbolum Fidei Nicænæ.

“ Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἓνα Θεόν, Πατέρα παντοκράτορα, πάντων ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀοράτων ποιητήν· καὶ εἰς ἓνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς, μονογενῆ, ΤΟΥΤΕΣΤΙΝ, ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρός· Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ, φῶς ἐκ φωτός, Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ· γεννηθέντα, οὐ ποιηθέντα· ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρί· δι’ οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, τὰ τε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ· τὸν δι’ ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα, καὶ σαρκωθέντα, ἐνανθρωπησάντα. παθόντα, καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς· ἐρχόμενον πάλιν κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς. Καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον. τοὺς δὲ λέγοντας, ἦν πότε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν, ἢ οὐκ ἦν πρὶν γεννηθῆναι, ἢ ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐγένετο ἢ ἐξ ἐτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας φάσκοντας εἶναι, ἢ κτιστὸν, ἢ ἀλλοίωτον ἢ τρεπτὸν τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τούτους ἀναθεματίζει ἡ καθολικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ Ἐκκλησία.”—
Socrat. Hist. Eccl. lib. i. c. 8.

The Creed of Epiphanius.

We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, *begotten of the Father before all ages*, THAT IS, *of the substance of His Father* ; Light of Light, very God of very God ; begotten, not made, of one substance with the Father ; by whom all things were made which are in Heaven and in earth ; who, for us men and our salvation, came down from Heaven, and was incarnate of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary, and was made man, and was crucified for us under Pontius Pilate, and suffered and was buried, and the third day rose again according to the Scriptures, and ascended into Heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father : and shall come again with glory to judge both the quick and the dead, of whose kingdom there shall be no end. And in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father, who, with the Father and the Son, together, is worshipped and glorified, who spake by the Prophets. And in one Catholic and Apostolic Church. We confess one baptism for the remission of sins, and we look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. But they who say, there was a time when the Son of God was not, or that He was not before He was begotten, or that He was made out of nothing, or of any other substance or essence, or that He is mutable or changeable, those the Catholic and Apostolic Church anathematizes.

Symbolum—Eriphanii.

“ Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἓνα Θεὸν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα, ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ τε καὶ γῆς, ὁρατῶν τε πάντων καὶ ἀοράτων· καὶ εἰς ἓνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, τὸν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς γεννηθέντα πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων· ΤΟΥΤΕΣΤΙΝ ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρὸς, φῶς ἐκ φωτός, Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα, ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρί· δι’ οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένοντο, τὰ τε ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ· τὸν δι’ ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν, καὶ σαρκωθέντα ἐκ Πνεύματος ἁγίου, καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου· καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, σταυρωθέντα τε ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, καὶ παθόντα, καὶ ταφέντα, καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς, καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, καὶ καθεζόμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ πάλιν ἐρχόμενον μετὰ δόξης, κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς· οὗ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος· καὶ εἰς το Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον, Κύριον, καὶ ζωοποιόν, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, τὸ σὺν Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ συνπροσκυνούμενον, καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον, τὸ λαλῆσαν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν· εἰς μίαν Καθολικὴν καὶ Ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν· ὁμολογοῦμεν ἓν βάπτισμα εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, προσδοκῶμεν ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν, καὶ ζωὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος, Ἀμήν. Τοὺς δὲ λέγοντας, ἦν ποτὲ, ὅτε οὐκ ἦν, καὶ πρὶν γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν· ἢ ὅτι ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐγένετο, ἢ ἐξ ἐτέρας ὑποστάσεως, ἢ οὐσίας, φάσκοντας εἶναι ῥευστὸν, ἢ ἀλλοιωτὸν τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ Υἱόν, τούτους ἀναθεματίζει ἡ Καθολικὴ καὶ Ἀποστολικὴ ἐκκλησία.”

—Eriphan. Anchorat. n. 120, tom. ii. p. 122.

NOTE (κ), page 61.

It was the custom of the Primitive Church, in the administration of baptism, to immerse the body *three times* in water. Tertullian, as I have already observed, has alluded to this practice in his treatise, Adv. Praxeam.: he alludes to it again in his treatise de Corona Militis, cap. iii. Cyril of Jerusalem also speaks of it as a well-known custom of the church to baptise by trine immersion, Catech. Myst. ii. n. 4. So also do many others, such as Gregory Nyssen de Bapt. Christi, tom. iii. 372; Hierome, Adv. Lucif. c. iv.; Ambrose, de Sacram. lib. ii. c. 7; Chrysostom, Hom. de Fide. tom. vii. p. 290; Basil de Spir. Sancto, c. xxvii.; and Augustine, Hom. iii. ap. Gratian de Consecrat. Dist. iv. cap. 78.

The design of this rite was to shew,—first, the Trinity of persons into whose names Christians were baptised. And secondly, the three days during which our Lord laid buried in the earth. “*Postquam vos credere promisistis, tertio capita vestra in sacro fonte demersimus. Qui ordo baptismatis duplici mysterii significatione celebratur. Recte enim tertio mersi estis, qui accepistis baptismum in nomine Trinitatis. Recte tertio mersi estis qui accepistis baptismum in nomine Jesu Christi qui die tertia resurrexit a mortuis, illa enim tertio repetita demersio typum Dominicæ exprimit sepulturæ.*”—Augustin. Hom. iii. ap. Gratian de Consecrat. Dist. iv. cap. 78.

The rite was also considered to denote the Unity of the Godhead as well as the Trinity of persons. “*Ter mergimur, ut Trinitatis unum appareat sacramentum, et non baptizamur in nominibus Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, sed in uno nomine, quod intelligitur Deus: potest et unum baptisma ita dici, quod licet ter baptizemur*

propter mysterium Trinitatis, tamen unum baptisma reputetur.—Hieron. lib. ii. in Ephes. iv. p. 222.

“Καὶ οὗτος ὁ κανὼν τῆς αὐτῆς δυνάμεως. διορίζεται γὰρ διὰ τριῶν μὲν καταδύσεων τὴν μυστήσιν ἐπιτελεῖσθαι τοῦ ἁγίου βαπτίσματος, ἡγουν εἰς ὄνομα πατρὸς, υἱοῦ, καὶ ἁγίου πνεύματος, ἅπαξ δὲ βαπτίζειν, διὰ τὸ ἐνιαῖον τῆς θεότητος, καὶ τὸ τρίτον τῶν ὑποστάσεων, κ.τ.λ.”—Theod. Balsam in κανων. ν’. SS. Apostol. p. 259. Paris, 1620.

And so significantly was this form of baptism supposed to express the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity in Unity, that one of the Apostolical Canons orders every Bishop or Presbyter to be deposed who shall administer baptism not by three immersions but by one only in the name of Christ:—“εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος ἢ πρεσβύτερος μὴ τρία βαπτίσματα μιᾶς μυστήσεως ἐπιτελέσῃ, ἀλλὰ ἐν βάπτισμα, τὸ εἰς τὸν θάνατον τοῦ Κυρίου διδόμενον, καθαιρεῖσθω. οὐ γὰρ εἶπεν ὁ Κύριος, εἰς τὸν θάνατον μου βαπτίσατε· ἀλλὰ πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος.”—Canon. SS. Apost. Can. i.

But when the Arians perverted the object and intention of this ancient rite, and taught the ignorant that three immersions signified three distinct substances—“*Then,*” says Wheatley, “*it first became a custom, and afterwards a law in the Spanish Church only to use one single immersion, because that would express the Unity of the Godhead, while the Trinity of Persons would be sufficiently denoted by the persons being baptized in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. However, in other parts of the Church, trine immersion most commonly prevailed, as it does in the Greek Church to this very day.*”—Wheatley on the Common Prayer, p. 359.

LONDON :
Printed by W. Clowes and Sons,
14, Charing Cross.





